The American Ecclesiastical Review

Vol. CX, No. 5 May, 1944

CONTENTS

God—A Blur in Modern Thought . . . . *John A. O'Brien* 321

Divino Afflante Spiritu: The New Encyclical on Biblical Studies. Part I . . . . *Michael J. Gruenthaner, S.J.* 330

Catholic Legislators . . . . *Francis J. Connell, C.SS.R.* 338

St. Bernardine of Siena . . . . *Raphael M. Huber, O.F.M.Conv.* 345

The Priest at the Church Door . . . . *Patrick M. Regan, S.J.* 359

Apologetics in the Second Century . . . . *Thomas B. Falls* 363

What is Our Real Catholic Population? *George A. Kelly and Thomas Coogan* 368

The Communion of Saints and the Mystical Body *Joseph Clifford Fenton* 378

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

Holy Name Communion Sunday 389

Promises in Mixed Marriages 389

More About Monsignori in Mufti 390

The Ordination Mass on a Double of the First Class 391

Contents Continued on Next Page

Published monthly by The Board of Trustees of The American Ecclesiastical Review, from Mt. Royal and Guilford Aves., Baltimore 2, Md. Subscription price, U. S. currency or equivalent: United States and Canada, $4.00—Foreign Postage, $1.00 additional. 40 cents per copy.

Entered as second class matter, January 10, 1944, at the Post Office at Baltimore, Maryland, under the Act of March 3, 1879. Accepted for mailing at the special rate of postage provided for under Act of March 5, 1930, under Act of February 28, 1925.

Business communications, including subscriptions and changes of address, should be addressed to The American Ecclesiastical Review, Mt. Royal and Guilford Aves., Baltimore 2, Maryland or to The Catholic University of America, Washington 17, D. C.

Please address all manuscripts and editorial correspondence to The Editor, The American Ecclesiastical Review Box 20A, The Catholic University of America, Washington 17, D. C.

Copyright 1944, by The American Ecclesiastical Review

Contents continued from previous page

QUODLIBET 392
Orestes Brownson, Yankee, Radical, Catholic, *by Theodore Maynard* 393
The Eucharist, The Mystery of Holy Thursday, *by Francois Mauriac* 394
Public Speaking, *by William R. Duffey and Francis A. Duffey, M.A.* 395
Men of Maryknoll, *by James Keller and Meyer Berger* 396
The Book of Ceremonies, *by Rev. Laurence J. O'Connell* 396
How to Think, *by Arthur D. Fearon, Ph.D.* 397
Professional Secrecy in the Light of Moral Principles, *by Robert E. Regan, O.S.A., S.T.D.* 398
Once in Cornwall, *by S.M.C.* 399
BOOK NOTES 400

CHANGE OF ADDRESS

We solicit your co-operation

NOTICE of change of address should be sent to us promptly, and at the same time the old address should be given.

Sometimes a subscriber overlooks reporting change of address and his copy continues to be sent to his former residence. In such case notification from successor would be appreciated.

THE AMERICAN
ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW
The Catholic University of America
Washington, 17, D. C.

GOD—A BLUR IN MODERN THOUGHT

What is the nature of God? This is a question of perennial timeliness. It is of especial importance to shepherds of souls charged with the task of making God and His Son, Jesus Christ, the supreme realities in their lives and in those of their flocks. If God is to be the Alpha and the Omega, the beginning and the end of all our strivings, He must be more than a name, more than an abstraction. He must be vivid and clear to us. We must be conscious of His presence within our beating hearts as well as throughout the vast universe.

Outside of the Catholic Church, God is often spoken of as though He were some vague impersonal force or power far off in space, with few, if any, points of contact with the inhabitants of this planet lost in the skies. By some He is identified in a vague way with the Cosmos; by others, with Nature. Both words are capitalized, but no attempt is made to indicate what new connotations they bear when thus spelled.

"AN OBLONG BLUR"

"The public utterances of many ministers, and the writings of many professors in Protestant theological institutions," the writer once remarked to Prof. Charles Foster Kent, the late head of the Yale Divinity School, "seem to display great obscurity and confusion."

"Yes," he replied, "I am sorry to be obliged to confess that God has become for many of them an oblong blur in the sky."

God—"an oblong blur in the sky!" Yet anyone who reads widely the philosophical journals, magazines and theological reviews of our day will be compelled to acknowledge the appropriateness of the comparison. With God stripped of all personal attributes, of the capacity to hear and answer prayers, of the capacity of solicitude and succour for humanity, He has been shoved increasingly into the background. The result is a religion without God, a vague sort of ethical uplift, in which the appeal is largely to social and humanitarian values.

In a lengthy discussion on the topic "Is There A God?" in *The Christian Century*, Professor Henry Nelson Wieman of the Divinity School of the University of Chicago, allegedly taking the affirmative side, mystified his opponent, Professor Max Carl Otto of Wisconsin University, by speaking of the deity in such nebulous terms that the latter could not understand him. When challenged to define what he meant by God, he defined Him as "that interaction between individuals, groups and ages which generates and promotes the greatest possible mutuality of good."[1] In other passages he describes God as "a total system of patterns."[2]

Alas! however, Prof. Otto was as much in the dark after the definition as he was before. He did not see how anyone could use such a deity for religious purposes. Nor could anyone else. One can't speak to a system of cosmic patterns, nor call upon *it*—the pronoun is Wieman's— for help in time of temptation or danger. One can admire a sky splashed with the colors of the setting sun. He can stand in awe before the Grand Canyon of Arizona. But he can love only a person and worship only a personal God.

After reading Wieman's definitions of God as "interaction" and as "a total system of patterns," and noting that he specifically stripped his deity of all personality and used the pronoun "it" in referring to his deity, Otto observed: "We are making progress—but whither? I should say toward a belief in God's non-existence. Why? Because as far as the great body of believers in God is concerned, Mr. Wieman turns out, when understood, to be *a first-rate atheist*."[3] Yet, Wieman is a professor in a *soi-disant* divinity school, preparing young men to instruct their flocks about God. "If in the green wood they do these things," one wonders, "what shall they do in the dry?"

A COSMIC UNCLE SAM

Yet Wieman is not alone. Prof. Edward Scribner Ames of the Disciples of Christ Divinity School, adjacent to the University of Chicago, has taught for many years a conception of God that rivals Wieman's in bizarreness, if not in nebulosity. God, maintains Dr. Ames, has no objective reality. He is something like a cosmic Uncle Sam. The latter, with his striped trousers, frock coat, and chin whiskers, is a figment of the imagination, but stands as a symbol of the United States. Thus he (or it?) serves a useful purpose. God is in the same category as Uncle Sam, a symbol invented by the imagination, serving a useful purpose, but devoid of all objective reality.

The professor sometimes serves on the faculty of the University of Chicago, especially during summer sessions. During a seminar for graduate students in philosophy, at which the writer was present, the professor had developed his conception of God as a cosmic Uncle Sam, a mythical being existing only in the imagination of the race. The students seemed mystified as to how they could get any help from such an imaginary being. Finally one of them said:

---

[1] Published in book form, *Is There a God?*, Chicago, Willett, Clark & Co., 1932, p. 13.

[2] *Op. Cit.*, p. 14.

[3] *Op. Cit.*, p. 70. (Italics mine.)

"Professor, I don't see how one could pray to a being who doesn't really exist. Why sing hymns to God, and ask His help in prayer, if He can't hear, can't help, and doesn't really exist at all?"

"Well," replied the professor, "you sing songs, don't you, in honor of your Alma Mater, though she can't hear you."

"Yes," replied the student, "we sing songs *about* our Alma Mater. Occasionally we may even sing to her. But we know that such is only a gesture in honor of the faculty, alumni and student body. We know that a vocal apostrophe to our school is only a figure of speech."

Then he added rather wistfully:

"I had thought that praying to God was more than a figure of speech, and that God was more than a conceptual myth."

The professor gave a talk at a Faculty Forum at the University of Illinois. He developed the theme of God as a cosmic Uncle Sam, a conceptual myth, which he presents in his book *Religion*. With no real God to worship, to love, or to serve, the faculty wondered where religion came in, and how such a man could be a professor in a "divinity" school. After the talk which stressed human values to the obliteration of the divine, a professor expressed the mind of most of the audience by observing:

"Why bother about using the word, *religion*, at all? If social duties and social values are everything, why not use the word *ethics* and drop the word, religion, altogether?"

"That's all right with me," replied the professor.

Then to let the faculty know that they had not misconstrued his message about a merely symbolic deity, in which human values embraced all that was contained in religion, Prof. Ames related this incident:

"After I had preached along these lines in a church in Chicago, an elderly lady came up to me.

" 'Reverend,' she said, 'I want you to know that I am an atheist also.' "

Instead of being horrified, the divinity school professor chuckled with glee. It was a good joke, he appeared to think. To those of us, not possessing his brand of humor, it seemed ghastly. To us, who believed that a God existing only as a conceptual myth is no God at all, the elderly woman had hit the nail on the head.

THE "YOU" OF THE UNIVERSE

The Dean of the Divinity School of Chicago University, at the time the writer was conducting his investigation of the concept of the deity held by his contemporaries at prominent American universities, was Shailer Matthews.

"What do you mean by God?" I asked the dean.

"Perhaps the best answer I can give is: God is the *You* of the universe."

"Exactly what you mean by that, dean," I observed, "is not entirely clear. Do you mean He is a personal being?"

"All we can say in that regard," replied the dean, "is that there is a personality-producing force or forces in the universe."

This was obscure enough. His book *The Growth of the Idea of God* did little, if anything, to dissipate the darkness.

Holding forth in philosophy during that summer session at Chicago University was Max Carl Otto, a visiting professor from the University of Wisconsin. The writer went to his lectures and found he was expounding the materialistic and atheistic philosophy which he has taught at Madison for so many years. Man, he declared dogmatically, is a physico-chemical organism, and God is a myth. The unvarnished atheism, which he taught at both these universities to the sons and daughters of Christian parents, robbing hundreds of their faith and putting the cancer of lasting doubt into the minds of others, is set forth bluntly and unapologetically in his published controversy with Wieman and McIntosh, *Is There A God?*

Leaving the beautiful campus of Chicago University, with its impressive Gothic buildings, founded by the devout Baptist, John D. Rockefeller, Sr., doubtless with the thought that it would deepen the faith of its students in God and in the spiritual values of life,we thought of the characterization which we had once seen in *The Christian Century*: "Chicago University is an institution in whose college of Liberal Arts the student learns that he has no soul, and in whose School of Divinity he learns that there is no God." The characterization was intended, we think, to be somewhat facetious. But to us it was more tragic than facetious, because it was so true.

THE NISUS OF THE UNIVERSE

The vagueness of the concepts of God is not confined to the academic circles in America. It exists in those of Britain as well. The dominant theme at the Catholic Conference of Ecclesiastical Studies which the writer attended at Cambridge University in March 1940, was The Menace of Unreason in the Modern World. The Rev. Dr. J. J. Curtin presented numerous quotations from the writings of prominent British philosophers showing the weird concepts of the deity which were being proposed for acceptance. One author seemed to outdo another in extravagant oddity. Bizarreness is the fashion of the hour. While the writer does not have Dr. Curtin's paper at hand, it is easy to present directly from their writings a few samples of this curious vogue.

Listen to S. Alexander of Manchester University: "If you ask me what God is, I can only answer he is a being whose body is the whole world of nature, but that world conceived as actually possessing deity, and therefore he is not actual as an existent but as an ideal, and only existent in so far as the tendency towards his distinctive character is existent in the actual world."[4]

Shades of Weiman and Ames! What kind of a cosmic conundrum do we have here? Let's see if we can follow this curious hodge-podge. God's "body is the whole world of nature." So far so good. Now that world is "conceived as *actually* possessing deity, and *therefore* he is *not* actual (?) as an existent but as an ideal." Here we bog down. How, we naively inquire, can the world *actually* possess deity if he doesn't actually exist? And why the *therefore* for such a curious *non-sequitur*? That adds insult to injury.

Then in the last clause of the same sentence we are told that as an ideal, he is "only existent in so far as the tendency towards his distinctive character is existent in the actual world." What is "his distinctive character"? What is the "tendency" to it? If the deity is not born yet, as Alexander asserts, how can it have a body?

Elsewhere he speaks of God as the *nisus* or striving of the universe to beget a deity. What is the evidence that the cosmos is in the throes of childbirth? How can he describe a cosmic offspring not yet born?

NO PUSHING FROM BEHIND

Recognizing that his concept of the deity and the resultant concept of religon will appear passing strange, if not completely unintelligible, Alexander proceeds: "But you will at once object, that my account or justification of religion would not be accepted by any known religion past or present." That certainly is true. For in all the vagaries of religious thought, even among primitive and barbarous tribes, mankind has never been asked to worship a deity that was not yet born.

---

[4] *Science and Religion*, New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1931, p. 136.

"God, you will say," he continues, "is on this showing an ideal being, whose deity does not yet exist, but is the next quality due to emerge, and cannot therefore be known by us. He exists only in the striving of the world to realize his deity, and to help it as it were to the birth. *Moreover, he is not a creator as in historical religions, but created.*" Here, overwhelmed with astonishment, we pause. Instead of lessening our bewilderment, Alexander increases it. For now we are told that the god we are to worship is one whom we can help get born. He is not our Creator, but he is our creature. Religion to Alexander thus means the *worshiping of a creature not yet born.*

How are we to worship and love a deity not yet born? These are hard questions, Alexander admits, but says he will do his best to answer. Here is his attempt: "It seems to me more reasonable (and helpful) to worship a being whose love draws us to him from in front, and whom we thus help into existence, rather than a being independent of our efforts, who pushes us from behind. We are creating something over which we have control rather than just obeying something we have to recognize."

The mystery deepens. Here we are told that a being draws us to him. But how could it either draw us to him or push us away from him, since it is not born yet and is therefore nonexistent? How can anything nonexistent act in any manner whatsoever? How could such a being, even after we help him to birth, be God when he is explicitly dependent upon us? How can that, which we *create* and which we *control*, be God?

It is evident that the anomalous thing which Alexander is talking about has no more resemblance to the God of the Judeo-Christian tradition than a stick or a stone or the cow that jumped over the moon. One can scarcely escape the conviction that Alexander's confusing and contradictory assertions are just so much philosophic *abracadabra*, so much verbal nebulosity, approaching sheer incoherence. With no thought of being captious and with every desire to recognize coherence and intelligibility where they are found, one can only wonder what the limits are in the grotesque and the unintelligible when speaking of God.

The god of Alfred N. Whitehead, formerly of Cambridge and now at Harvard, is likewise so steeped in the fog of metaphysical obscurity that it is a question if any philosopher really understands him. It is certain, however, that his deity is not available for religious purposes and for the mass of humanity is nonexistent. Because of the wide influence of Whitehead upon metaphysicians, both in Britain and in America, we plan to analyze his concept of God in a succeeding article.

VARIATIONS IN PATTERN

While H. G. Wells has, of course, no standing as a philosopher or as a scholar, his novels have had considerable circulation and he manages to get his views on nearly every subject quoted in the press. In *Anticipations*, he draws a caricature of the Christian conception of God as a vigorous but uncertain old gentleman with a beard and an inordinate lust for praise and propitiation.[5] Attacking the idea of the omnipotence of God, Mr. Wells writes: "If I thought there was an omnipotent God who looked down on battles and deaths and all the waste and horror of this war—able to prevent these things—doing them to amuse himself, [*sic*] I would spit in his empty face."[6]

In somewhat similar, though less violent strain, writes May Sinclair: "The worst God of all is the God of the older Christian theology: God the Father, the creator of evil, who in His all-power and all-knowledge deliberately plans a cruel universe bristling with traps for His creatures. The older theology thought of God as spending every moment of His eternity in eavesdropping and spying on immoral man, haunting every bedroom and listening to every obscene story, and equally observant of the murderer with his bloody chopper and the child with its fingers in the jam."[7]

We cited the last two instances of invective as variations in the prevalent pattern of obscurity and unintelligibility. The fashion among philosophers, especially metaphysicians, still runs to the bizarre and the grotesque. Many of them seem to achieve their greatest extravagance and obscurity when treating of God. This vagueness would seem to have kinship with the vogue of the unintelligible that has been so pronounced in certain literary circles within recent years. James Joyce and Gertrude Stein have been the highpriest and highpriestess of the cultus of the unintelligible. But they have had many disciples.

CULTUS OF THE UNINTELLIGIBLE

We quote a typical passage from Miss Stein's play, *Four Saints in Three Acts*: "Saint Theresa in a storm at Avila there can be rain and warm snow and warm that is the water is warm the river is not warm the sun is not warm and if to stay to cry. If to stay to if to stay if staying to stay to if having to stay if to cry to stay if to cry stay to cry to stay."

---

[5] *Anticipations*, p. 306.

[6] *Mr. Britling Sees It Through*, p. 397.

[7] *The New Idealism*, pp. 304–305.

Can anyone make sense of that? Did the audience know what she was talking about? Listen to the comment of the dramatic critic, Mark Barron, written after attending the opening performance in New York:

"The audience was stuffed like a plum pudding with celebrated names, ermine coats and raised eyebrows, but I didn't hear one of them admit that he knew what Miss Stein was writing about. They tittered and giggled through the performance, and, at the final curtain, shouted 'Bravo!' "

The critic's characterization, they tittered, giggled, and applauded, is excellent. But of what they were applauding, they had not the ghost of an idea. Such applause, bowing of heads, offering of incense, are all rites in the strange cultus of incoherent prose, cubistic painting, anvil and taxi horn symphonies, nebulous poetry, and may we add, unintelligible philosophy.

Even more highly acclaimed than the writings of Miss Stein are those of James Joyce. In his last work, *Finnegan's Wake*, he achieves complete and utter incoherence. We quote a specimen from his earlier *Work in Progress*, wherein the unintelligible would seem to be consciously aimed at:

"My long farewell I send to you, fair dream of sport and game and always something new. Gone is Haun! My grief, my ruin! Our Jose-el-Jovan. Our Chrisna-Murty! Tis' well you'll be looked after from last to first as yon beam of light we follow receding on your photophoric pilgrimage to your antipodes in the past, you who so often consigned your distributory tidings of great joy into our nevertoolatetolove box, mansuetudinous manipulator, victimisedly victorihoarse, dearest Haun of all, lampaddyfair, postanulengro, our romanychiel."

THE ANSWER

We have cited the cases of James Joyce and Gertrude Stein because they illustrate in the wider field of general literature the point we are making in regard to the metaphysical treatment of the idea of God, namely, that coherence and intelligibility are not essential for high acclaim among the so-called moderns. We believe it is a passing fad. But it is a distressing one while it lasts.

It has, of course, gained no entrance into that divinely founded bastion of truth, the Catholic Church. There the emphasis is now, as it always has been, upon objective truth, rational thinking, and clear, unequivocal expression. In contrast with the vagueness, vacillation and unbelief characterizing many of the contemporary conceptions of God, stands the clear teaching of the Catholic Church. Unmoved by the shifting currents of belief or of unbelief, making no concessions to the *Zeitgeist*, the Church proclaims the true nature of almighty God with a definiteness and a precision which afford no grounds for uncertainty or misunderstanding.

Men will tire of the passing fads and fashions of the day and they will hunger, as they always have, for truth and reason. They will find in the carefully reasoned and clearly expressed teachings of the Catholic Church about God, and in the *philosophia perennis* of her great Schoolmen, the answer to their groping minds and the manna for their hungry hearts. She is the great stabilizer of the sane thinking of the race, the anchor to the windward when the tempests of unreason sweep the world. She is the great Custodian of divine truth, who keeps ever before the eyes of men the vision of God, which she received from her divine Founder, Jesus Christ. That divine revelation concerning God, our Beginning and our End, our Creator and our loving Father, she shall not fail to hold up before the searcher's eyes, the questing minds and the hungry hearts of men till the last soul is gathered unto the eternal hills.

Notre Dame, Ind. JOHN A. O'BRIEN.

DIVINO AFFLANTE SPIRITU
THE NEW ENCYCLICAL ON BIBLICAL STUDIES

Under the guidance of the Divine Paraclete the Church has ever shown a keen alertness to contemporary thought and a striking power to adapt herself to changing conditions, without sacrificing any of her beliefs or moral principles. The new Encyclical on cultivating and fostering biblical studies, which begins with the significant words, *Divino Afflante Spiritu* (Under the Inspiration of the Divine Spirit), and was issued on the feast of St. Jerome, the patron of Scripture scholars, Sept. 30, 1943, is another conspicuous example of this alertness and adaptability. While it stresses the divine and immemorial teaching of the Church on the inspiration and truth of the Bible, it also inculcates the most modern methods of making the word of God more intelligible, more acceptable, and more effective in the present age. It is undoubtedly a worthy successor and a long expected complement to the *Providentissimus Deus* of Leo XIII and the *Spiritus Paraclitus* of Benedict XV.

Like these classical pronouncements on the study of Sacred Scripture, it shows the way and will, doubtless, lead to important developments in the scientific exposition and popular presentation of the Bible. The Catholic biblical scholar must hail it with intense gratitude and unalloyed satisfaction. But it will, also, deepen his sense of responsibility and leave him with a feeling of apprehensive inadequacy. He may well fear that he cannot realize all the high ideals which are proposed for his consideration. In fact, it will require the co-operative and self-sacrificing labor of eminent scholars in all the various fields of scriptural endeavor to bring the aims of the Encyclical to factual fruition. It is, therefore, an invitation, especially to young and talented priests, not to shirk the toil involved in the scientific study of Holy Writ but to consider it a vocation worthy of the finest intellects and the most generous efforts. Its purpose is not merely to confute the hypercritics but also, and primarily, to enlighten the minds and inflame the hearts of the faithful by an exact, full, and effective elucidation of the divine wisdom latent in the sacred pages.

The nucleus from which the doctrine of the Encyclical springs is contained in its opening sentence: "Under the inspiration of the Divine Spirit the sacred writers composed the books which God, in accordance with His paternal love, wished to bestow as a gift 'for teaching, for reproving, for correcting, for instructing in justice; that the man of God may be perfect, equipped for every good work.' "[1] This emphatic and unequivocal statement of the divine origin and purpose of the Bible gives rise to the trend of thought which dominates the Encyclical: how books so sublime in authorship and so lofty in aim should be regarded and explained, especially in the present age.

Couched in the stately, rhythmic Latin prose of a classical tradition, the exposition is comprehensive, clear, forceful, cogent, and logically well-articulated. To be fully appreciated, the Encyclical must be read carefully and in its entirety. In recapitulating its contents, we shall content ourselves with emphasizing the more salient topics. In accordance with our scope, we shall summarize, paraphrase, quote, or expand as may seem most advisable in connection with any particular point of the Encyclical.

Before entering upon his main theme, the Sovereign Pontiff recalls the decrees of the Tridentine and Vatican Councils concerning the Scriptures, and the enactments of Leo XIII, Benedict XV, and Pius XI relating to them. He concludes this historical survey with a brief resumé of the splendid results already achieved by these measures of his predecessors.[2]

MOTIVES AND OBJECTIVES

At this juncture the reader may well ask: If the directions of previous Popes have been so wise and effective, what can be the utility, motive, and object of the present Encyclical? In reply to this tacit query of the reader, the Holy Father points to the profound changes wrought by modern discovery and research in the conditions surrounding scriptural studies since the days of the *Providentissimus Deus*. At that time but a few biblical sites had been excavated in Palestine. Meanwhile, however, the number of these excavations has been very considerably augmented; they have been conducted with greater scientific rigor and with a technical skill which has reached a high degree of development. As a result, our knowledge of biblical archeology is far greater in extent and in certainty than it was in the days of Leo XIII. "How much light is derived from these investigations for a more correct and complete understanding of the sacred books is known to all the experts and to all who are engaged in these studies."[3]

---

[1] *AAS* XXXV, 1943 (NCWC Feb. 1944), p. 297.

[2] Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 297–305.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 305.

The importance of these explorations in Bible lands is heightened by the fact that written documents have been repeatedly unearthed, which contribute much towards a knowledge of the languages, the literature, the history, the customs, the religious beliefs and practices of ancient peoples. Of scarcely less moment than these documents are the papyri which have been discovered and examined: they have been of such great value in learning to know the literature as well as the public and private institutions prevalent especially around the time of Our Saviour.

Furthermore, very old codices of the sacred books have been found and published with expert scientific care. The exegesis, also, of the Fathers has been investigated more extensively and more fully. Finally, the conversational, narrative, and literary style of the ancients may now be illustrated with innumerable examples. "All these gains, made by our present age, not without the design of Divine Providence, invite, as it were, and admonish those who interpret Holy Writ to use eagerly the great light granted to them to scrutinize the word of God more thoroughly, to illumine it more clearly, and to expound it more lucidly. We observe with the greatest consolation of soul that they have already obeyed and are still obeying this invitation assiduously. This, certainly, is not the last or the least effect of the Encyclical Letter, *Providentissimus Deus*. Presaging, as it were, this new efflorescence of biblical science, Our predecessor, Leo XIII, by this letter both summoned Catholic exegetes to toil and wisely defined for them the path and method of their toil. That this toil may not only constantly persevere but that it may even be perfected and rendered evermore fecund is the purpose which we also wish to attain by the present Encyclical Letter. It is our principal aim to show to all the tasks which still remain to be performed and the attitude of mind with which so great and so lofty a charge is to be undertaken, as well as to provide the laborers who are diligently working in the vineyard of the Lord with new incentives and new courage."[4]

STUDY OF THE BIBLICAL LANGUAGES

After setting forth the motives and objectives of the Encyclical, the Holy Father defines the qualities requisite in a truly competent expositor of the Scriptures. First of all, he should possess a knowledge of the languages in which the books of the Bible were originally written. These, as we know, are Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek. Why this is the case need not be discussed here; it is fully explained in all the standard text-books of Biblical Introduction.

---

[4] *Ibid.*, pp. 305–306.

The Encyclical admits that the study of Hebrew was cultivated but sparingly and imperfectly in the early Church, despite the example of St. Jerome and the advice of St. Augustine. It also grants that even the knowledge of Greek was at a low ebb in the Middle Ages, so much so that even the most eminent commentators of that age confined themselves to an exposition of the Latin text. But the Holy Father utterly repudiates the idea that the biblical languages can be neglected in the present age by anyone who professes to be a capable interpreter of the Bible.

Ignorance of these languages would exclude the interpreter from the ranks of modern scholars and cultured men. Today, almost all serious students of antiquity and literature are familiar with Greek. Even a knowledge of Hebrew is widely diffused among educated men. We may add that this holds true especially of America. All the better Protestant seminaries teach Hebrew and Greek; the American Oriental Society has a noteworthy number of members thoroughly acquainted with the languages of the Ancient Near East; some of the world's greatest authorities on the philology and archeology of the Bible may now be found in the universities of this country, where they display an unremitting activity in research.

Moreover, as the Encyclical indicates, the exegete who is unacquainted with the biblical languages can scarcely allege a valid excuse for his deficiency. The means for acquiring these languages are abundant and accessible. Not a few universities offer well-organized courses conducted by able professors; excellent dictionaries and grammars may readily be found; editions of the Hebrew, Greek, and Syriac texts may be procured at a reasonable price; scientific commentaries, articles, and monographs abound. Hence a lack of opportunity of frequenting the schools established for the purpose could be supplied by earnest private study. The judgment, therefore, which the Encyclical pronounces upon an exegete refusing to learn the languages of the Bible is deservedly severe: "He can in no wise escape the stigma of superficiality and sloth."[5]

The Catholic interpreter has an additional motive for acquiring these languages. They are the medium which the sacred writers were inspired to adopt when composing the primary text of the Bible. Now, "it is the duty of the exegete to seize eagerly, as it were, and with the highest care and veneration, anything, even the slightest detail, which has come from the pen of the sacred writer under the inspiration of the Divine Spirit, in order that he may understand the author's mind more deeply and fully."[6]

---

[5] *Ibid.*, p. 307.

Consequently, the Holy Father exhorts exegetes "to endeavor sedulously to attain an ever increasing proficiency in the biblical and the other Oriental languages."[7] The fact that he recommends the study of the other languages of the Near East is not at all surprising, for they are either cognate or belong to the same general culture cycle. Hence they may cast light upon some obscure root, idiom, or construction in the original text of the Scriptures. The researches of Joüon, G. Driver, and Winton Thomas show how enlightening the comparative study of these languages can be.

As the Holy Father remarks, the exegete is to uphold his interpretation with all the aids that the philology of any pertinent language may supply. Just as St. Jerome and other eminent commentators of the past used the linguistic science of their day, so we should employ the resources of modern philology "to explain the primary text, which because it was written by the author himself, has greater authority and weight than any translation, either ancient or modern, no matter how excellent it may be."[8]

TEXTUAL CRITICISM

But the original drafts of the sacred books made by the inspired writers or under their unerring supervision have long since disappeared. The manuscripts of the primary text at our disposal are nothing but copies; even the oldest of them have had a formidable line of ancestors. In the course of centuries of transcription the original text has inevitably undergone some accidental modifications.

These considerations, undoubtedly, prompted the Holy Father to propose the judicious exercise of textual criticism as the second prerequisite for the successful interpretation of the Scriptures.

After quoting St. Augustine on the imperative need of corrected codices, the Encyclical warmly endorses the science and art of textual criticism, declaring that it has a perfect right to be practiced, on account of the reverence due to the sacred text. "For the service for which it was designed and which it renders consists in restoring the

[6] *Ibid.*
[7] *Ibid.*
[8] *Ibid.*

sacred text as perfectly as possible, in purifying it from the corruptions due to the frailty of copyists, in freeing it, as far as possible, from glosses, lacunae, transpositions of words, repetitions, and other errors of all kinds which usually creep into a literary work handed down for many centuries."[9] The Holy Father concedes that textual criticism has been abused in the past, but declares that "its rules have now reached such a degree of stability and security that textual criticism has become an excellent means for publishing the divine word with greater purity and accuracy and that any abuse can be detected with ease."[10]

Since textual criticism has been so highly perfected, the Holy Father urges Catholic biblical scholars to essay a task which he pronounces honorable but not always easy. "They are to make every effort that, at the first favorable opportunity, editions of the sacred writings and the ancient versions be provided by Catholics, which have been edited according to these standards, editions, namely, which combine the highest reverence for the sacred text with an accurate observance of all the critical laws. All should know well that this labor, which will take a long time, is not only necessary for the comprehension of writings given by divine inspiration but is also urgently demanded by that piety which makes it incumbent upon us to be grateful in the highest degree to a most provident God, who sent these books from the throne of His majesty, like letters from a father to his own children." [11]

THE AUTHENTICITY OF THE VULGATE

But does not this insistence on the authority of the primary text conflict in some way with the decree of the Council of Trent on the authenticity of the Vulgate? The answer which the Pope gives to this oft-repeated and oft-debated question does not differ essentially from the solution proposed by the majority of capable theologians before the appearance of the present Encyclical. This solution now has the authority of Pontifical approval and can no longer be impugned by over-zealous and ill-informed champions of the Vulgate.

The Encyclical proves, in the first place, that the Tridentine Council never had any intention of prohibiting the use of the original text, for the Council commissioned its presiding officers to petition the Pope then reigning to issue corrected editions, first of the Latin, then of the

---

[9] *Ibid.*, pp. 307–308.

[10] *Ibid.*, p. 308.

[11] *Ibid.*

Greek and Hebrew texts. This petition, which was duly presented, was not fulfilled; not because of any hostility to the original text but because of the distressing conditions of the times.

The Encyclical then examines the provision of the Council that "the Vulgate is to be used by all as authentic." It explains that this provision never applied to absolutely all Catholics but was directed only to the Latin Church. Hence the Oriental Churches in union with Rome were permitted to use the version traditionally accepted as authentic in their own particular rites. Finally, the Encyclical proves that the Vulgate is prescribed only for public official use even in the Latin Church. This leaves the biblical student free to employ any text or version not otherwise objectionable in private reading or study. The Tridentine decree, therefore, "undoubtedly does not lessen the authority and force of the primary text."[12]

This is proven still more by the fact that the Vulgate was not declared superior to the original text when it was pronounced authentic. When this decree was passed the original text was not under discussion. The Council was concerned only with the Latin versions in circulation at the time. Among these it rightly declared that version to be authentic "which has been approved in the Church itself by the long use of so many centuries."

Now an authentic version is one which is at least substantially conformed to the original and for this reason is trustworthy and acceptable. Its conformity to the original may be known either through the testimony of some unexceptionable authority or on the basis of critical comparison and investigation. In the first case, the authenticity of the translation is purely juridical; in the second, it is critical.

With these definitions in mind, the Encyclical proceeds to explain the authenticity of the Vulgate. This was not decreed "chiefly for critical reasons but rather on account of the legitimate use of the Vulgate in the Church during the course of so many centuries. This use proves that the Vulgate, in the sense that it has been understood and is understood by the Church, is immune from any error whatever in matters of faith and morals. Consequently, as the Church herself testifies and confirms, it may be quoted in disputations, lectures, and sermons with safety and without the danger of committing error. Now authenticity of this kind is not primarily termed *critical* but rather *juridical*."[13]

---

[12] *Ibid.*, p. 309.

[13] *Ibid.*

Since the doctrinal authority of the Vulgate is based only on the infallible testimony of the Church, we may have recourse to the original text to prove and confirm the teaching of the Vulgate or to clarify the sense of obscure passages. The Encyclical not only allows this but declares that it is almost imperative to do so at the present time. This is easy to understand if we remember that there are so many today who do not admit the teaching authority of the Church.

In concluding his discussion of the decree of the Council of Trent the Holy Father re-affirms the attitude of the Church towards translations of the Vulgate into the vernacular. They are not prohibited by the decree and may be made for the use and benefit of the faithful and to render the word of God more intelligible. Even versions of the original text are permitted. "This, as we know, has been done laudably in many countries, with the approval of ecclesiastical authority."[14]

(*To be continued.*)

Washington, D. C. MICHAEL J. GRUENTHANER, S.J.

[14] *Ibid.*

CATHOLIC LEGISLATORS

The legislators of our country, whether federal or state, occupy a very responsible position. In the course of the next few years their tasks will undoubtedly become more complicated and more important. They will be required to pass laws on matters of vital consequence to the well-being of America, and perhaps even on questions relevant to the peace and happiness of the whole world. There was never a time in the history of our country when we stood in greater need of capable and conscientious lawmakers.

The Catholic legislator is unquestionably aided in making his decisions by the definite and adequate norms of right and wrong which his Church proposes. However, this advantage is linked up with an obligation—the obligation of regulating his official conduct according to the unchanging principles of morality, and not according to the flexible standards of expediency which are so unhesitatingly accepted by many modern statesmen. The Catholic in public office may not forget his Church's solemn warning that he must one day render to the Divine Judge a strict account of the manner in which his official conduct has corresponded to the special enlightenment and the supernatural guidance available to him as a member of Christ's Mystical Body.

Strange and sad to say, there are Catholic legislators apparently beset with the fear that the principles of their religion may prove a handicap to the performance of their public duties. In their anxiety not to be accused of prejudice in favor of the "Catholic side" of an issue, they will vote for the opposite side, or at least abstain from voting. Now, any one who is sincerely convinced that Catholicism is the only true religion and that the Catholic Church is protected in its teaching function by the Spirit of God must realize that Catholic principles, properly applied, will promote the best interests of civil society. Indeed, the moral and social principles taught by the Catholic Church can be, in great part, defended convincingly by natural reason, independently of the authority of divine revelation as proposed by the infallible Church, on which Catholics base their acceptance. The Church's teachings on the rights of the individual, marriage and the family, education, the relations between employers and employees, the requirements for a just war, international arbitration, etc., have an intrinsic cogency that appeals to every intelligent and honest person. And so, the Catholic legislator has no reason to fear that he is unduly favoring his religion when he applies such teachings to the government of a society in which Catholics are a minority group. In reality he is using principles of the most sound political wisdom, principles whose value has been proved time and time again in the history of governments, principles which furnish the best safeguard of the vitality and of the progress of any nation.

Of course, it must be remembered that in the United States Catholics seek no special governmental favors for their Church as an organization. This is not merely a matter of expediency, a protection against the attacks of bigotry. It is a matter of principle, a consequence of our wholehearted acceptance of the American plan of according equal rights to all religious organizations. Catholics are not so illogical as to believe that, as far as God's law is concerned, any religion has a real right to exist save the one true religion established by the Son of God for all mankind. But, as far as civil rights in the United States are concerned, we believe that the most practical plan is to have perfect equality for all religions. Catholic legislators have no right to transgress this rule, even in a particular instance, by supporting legislation favorable to the Catholic Church which they would not grant to any other religious organization in the same circumstances. In a word, the Catholic Church in the United States seeks from the government only its civil right of perfect equality with other religious bodies. Writing more than a century ago, Archbishop Kenrick laid down this rule for our Catholic legislators: "Catholic legislators may not by their votes approve whatever is opposed to the teaching of the Church—for example, that divorce *a vinculo* should be given on account of adultery or for any other reason. Neither may they approve heresy or indifferentism or the usurped ministry of heretical preachers. But they are not to be blamed if they give aid toward legislation by which the rights of all citizens are protected according to the Constitution."[1]

Priests are sometimes consulted by legislators concerning the stand they should take on certain proposed measures. This is a perfectly lawful procedure, for even those in very high civil offices in our land have private citizens as their intimate counsellors. But the priest who is thus consulted must remember that his advice must not take the form of a dabbling in politics. Against this the Third Council of

---

[1] *Theologia Moralis*, Philadelphia, 1841, Vol. I, p. 400.

Baltimore has warned the clergy of our country.[2] The priest's counsel is to consist in the presentation and the explanation of the ethical and religious principles bearing on the legislator's official duties, and in exhortations to be faithful to his obligations. Indeed, this function of the priest was mentioned by the Council, immediately after its warning to priests not to interfere unduly in politics: "These admonitions, however, are not to be understood in the sense that they must be silent about the very grave obligation by which the citizens are bound, even in public matters, always and everywhere, to labor for the greater good of religion and of the country, according to the dictate of conscience before God."[3]

Accordingly, when consulted about a legislative problem involving particular facts, the priest's advice should usually be couched as a general moral principle rather than as a recommendation of a particular policy. In other words, he should inform the statesman of the ethical tenets pertinent to the matter, but leave their application to him. For the average priest is not sufficiently conversant with the factual details to render prudently a definite decision on legislative proposals of this category. Thus, the priest may explain to a legislator the moral principle that public funds should not be expended unless compensating public benefits can be expected; but usually it would be rash for him to urge the legislator to vote for an appropriation of fifty million dollars for the construction of a certain dam, the feasibility of which is under discussion.

To come now to particular principles by which the Catholic legislator should be guided:—No legislation opposed to the natural law may receive his vote of approval. Such would be legislation authorizing the establishment of birth-control clinics or the spreading of information helpful to contraceptive practices. The same is true of legislative measures prescribing or permitting "eugenic" sterilization. All Catholic legislators should be aware of their obligation to vote against such measures, not because they are opposed to any distinctively Catholic doctrine, but because they are violations of the natural law, promulgated by God through the light of human reason, and binding all human beings, irrespective of their creed.

Generally speaking, the same principle would apply to legislation permitting civil divorce *a vinculo*. However, one exception might be made in this connection. In the near future our legislators may be confronted with a proposal to establish a uniform code of divorce laws throughout the country. In the supposition that such a code would definitely diminish the number of divorces in our land, there seems to be no reason, from the moral standpoint, why a Catholic legislator could not vote for it, on the principle that one may advocate the lesser of two evils, when one of the two is sure to ensue.

---

[2] Cf. *Conc. Plen. Balt. III*, *Acta et Decreta*, n. 83.

[3] *Ibid.*

From time to time we hear of attempts to tax church property. What should be the stand of a Catholic legislator toward proposals of this nature? As regards the taxation of churches themselves, he should unquestionably oppose it; he should uphold the policy of tax-exemption for all buildings used primarily as places of religious worship. There can be no objection to such a stand by a Catholic legislator on the grounds of partiality toward his own religion, since he would favor the extension of this privilege to the churches of all denominations. Fortunately, the great majority of our legislators, whatever their religious beliefs, favor the exemption of churches and of the land on which they stand. As Carl Zollmann says in reference to the rise of tax-exemption statutes in our country: "The practice of exempting church property was universally considered to be proper, and was so entirely in accord with the public sentiment that it universally prevailed."[4] As regards the concession of tax-exemption to parochial schools, the general attitude of our people toward favoring educational institutions—even though they are not public schools in the commonly accepted sense—usually smooths over all difficulties for a Catholic legislator.

A more difficult question arises in connection with legislation aimed at taxing property owned by the Church, but not used specifically for religious purposes, such as rectories, parish-halls, playgrounds, etc. A Catholic legislator familiar with the teachings of his Church regarding the immunity of ecclesiastical goods, might be uncertain about his obligation in conscience. The words of Ottaviani contain a practical solution: "In practice a very moderate immunity is urged and prevails regarding goods which are properly called ecclesiastical. While the Church claims full immunity for those things which directly and immediately serve for divine worship, she frequently relaxes to a very great extent the exercise of her right in respect to other things which only mediately tend toward divine worship. . . . Hence, if the State can impose taxes on ecclesiastical property, this is not the result of any proper and natural right exercised (by the State). For, as far as rights are concerned, just as the Church acquires dominion independently, so she could independently possess all her property and gain the fruits of it, without any diminution because of civil taxes. . . . But, unless the opposite is evident, the tacit consent or toleration of the Church must be presumed in order that taxation may be extended to that portion of ecclesiastical goods which, in the judgment of the Church, remains after necessary expenses for cult have been deducted." Ottaviani then adds reasons why the Church tolerates the taxation of property not directly concerned with divine worship—the willingness of the Church to aid the State, the equity of subsidizing public works advantageous to ecclesiastical persons and property, the avoidance of hostility which would come to the Church from the laity if the Church enjoyed the privilege of immunity in the fullest measure.[5]

---

[4] *American Church Law*, p. 329.

If these principles could be applied even in a Catholic country, *a fortiori* a Catholic legislator in our country could sometimes be fully justified in approving the taxation of church property not immediately used for purposes of divine worship, particularly if he felt that such a measure would be a protection against bigotry or against attempts at a sweeping rejection of all tax-exemption of religious property. Needless to say, the Catholic legislator would favor the consistent application of either exemption or non-exemption to all church property, Catholic or non-Catholic, in the same circumstances. At the same time it is well for Catholic legislators to realize that there are some persons in our country who are opposed to tax-exemption of church property through a hatred of religion rather than through a desire of the common good, and civil officials should not encourage such activities, so detrimental to the spiritual vitality of our nation.

The question of military conscription of all our young men as a permanent policy for our country is likely to be raised in the near future. It is hard to see how such a policy can *per se* be regarded as desirable in the United States, for it is a notable restriction of the personal liberty that is so basic a feature of our American way of life. Furthermore, a large standing army in peacetime creates an urge to go to war. Catholics cannot give unqualified approval to such a policy, because it is out of harmony with the Pope's plea for a gradual disarmament. However, *per accidens* a large army and navy may be necessary for our country even after the war for a period of some years, and universal conscription may be the necessary means to recruit an armed force of the required proportions. In such an event,

---

[5] Cf. *Institutiones Juris Publici Ecclesiastici*, Vol. I, n. 206 (translation ours).

Catholic legislators should be aware of the exemption from military service which the Church regards as a privilege of clerics (Can. 121), and should insist as far as they can, that this immunity be respected.[6] Naturally, they would favor the extension of this same privilege to candidates for the ministry in other religious denominations. Such an exception should not be difficult to obtain, for the majority of Americans would certainly favor exemption from military service for clergymen and candidates for the ministry, at least when the stress of war is passed.

Educational problems are frequently presented to legislative bodies. Every Catholic legislator should be familiar with at least the basic ethical truths pertinent to education. He should know that by the natural law the primary right and duty to educate children belongs to their parents, so that any attempt to force the attendance of children at public schools against the will of the parents—provided they have the children adequately educated elsewhere—is a violation of the natural law. It has also been declared a violation of our constitutional rights. Nevertheless, even though this principle has the corroboration of our highest judiciary body, legislators must be on their guard against attempts to lessen parental authority in the matter of education and to subordinate it more and more to governmental supervisions.

The question of federal aid to public schools, though not directly involving moral issues, has certain significant connotations. A bill providing for such aid was introduced in Washington about a year ago by Senator Thomas of the Senate Committee on Education and Labor. It is certainly objectionable on the grounds that the millions of dollars in annual subsidy which it would grant to the states would mean additional taxes, and that in turn would mean that the Catholics of the country, who are now supporting their parochial schools in addition to paying their share of taxes for public schools, would have a greatly increased burden without any benefits. Furthermore, such a procedure, in its actual application, would surely interfere with the local control of the purposes and processes of education.[7]

---

[6] This privilege is granted, not only to all clerics who have received the tonsure, but also to religious, including novices, and to all clerical students living in a seminary. Cf. Coronata, *Compendium Juris Canonici*, Vol. I, n. 374; cf. also Can. 614, 680.

[7] These arguments are developed more fully by the Rt. Rev. Msgr. Edward B. Jordan, Vice-Rector of the Catholic University, in a pamphlet, *Federal Aid to Schools* (NCWC 1944).

Other subjects of state or national interest, such as labor control, social security, socialized medicine, housing projects, etc., will probably become vital issues for our legislators in the not too distant future. But the Catholic legislator who is familiar with the clear, logical doctrines of his Church on moral and social topics—particularly those proposed in the recent encyclicals—is well prepared to decide the stand he should take on these matters. Our country will indeed be benefitted if Catholic legislators of the crucial years to come have both the wisdom and the strength of character to apply the teachings of their religion to the vexing and complex problems which they are sure to encounter.

International relations will have to be defined after the war. Questions will arise that will put even the most able and conscientious lawmakers in a quandary. However, there is one principle which no Catholic can doubt, for it is a truth contained in the Christian concept of charity and emphasized by the Sovereign Pontiffs—that some manner of collaboration with other nations, for the promotion of the common good of mankind, is an ideal to be striven for. Complete isolationism as a principle is at variance with the law of Christ. Similarly, a Catholic must hold that a strong nation should be concerned with the plight of a smaller nation oppressed by a tyrannical government. But this does not mean that a great nation must (or even may) involve itself in a disastrous war with a merely probable expectation of assisting the smaller nation.

Catholic legislators must expect to be regarded with suspicion by some of their fellow-citizens, who are convinced that no Catholic in public life can be loyal both to his Church and to his country. But this must not sway them from the path of duty. It is deplorable when a Catholic statesman, under the influence of criticism—or from fear that he will fall into disfavor with his constituents—acts against principles he knows to be true. We must try to develop, with the assistance of God, legislators who will consistently direct their official activities by the principles of the Catholic faith, properly understood and correctly applied. For, under the guidance of such men, the freedom of our people is most securely maintained and the prosperity of the United States, both material and spiritual, is most effectively guaranteed.

Washington, D. C. FRANCIS J. CONNELL, C.SS.R.

ST. BERNARDINE OF SIENA

St. Bernardine of Siena, the great Franciscan preacher, reformer, and devotee of the Holy Name of Jesus, died May 30, 1444. This month and year then mark the fifth hundredth anniversary of his death. Ecclesiastical celebrations, cultural *accadamie*, and literary symposia will commemorate the event throughout the Christian world; novenas, triduums and other exercises will be held. Since the world war may interfere with the observance in many countries, it will be America's privilege to compensate these deficiencies by added tokens of loyalty and appreciation. Pope Pius XII has deigned to honor the occasion by a special Apostolic Letter.[1]

HIS LIFE

St. Bernardine was born at Massa, a town near Siena, of the noble family of Albizeschi, Sept. 8, 1380. Left an orphan at the age of six, he was taken care of by his pious aunts. Later he studied civil and canon law, and under the wise and prudent direction of the Conventual, Blessed John of Ristori, made rapid progress in sanctity. In 1400 he helped with great personal sacrifice the plague-stricken of Siena and, assisted by ten other companions, took charge of a hospital. During this time he is said to have contracted an illness from which he never fully recovered.

On Sept. 8, 1402 he entered the Order of the Friars Minor at the convent of *San Francesco* in Siena. In the company of Ristori he retired to Columbaio, outside of the city, to complete his novitiate. On Sept. 8, 1403 he made his religious profession and on Sept. 8, 1404 he was ordained to the priesthood. The convent chronicle of Siena shows that he was affiliated with that convent. In 1413 he was elected its *discretus*, which gave him the right to represent the convent at various Provincial gatherings, e.g., at a Provincial Chapter.

St. Bernardine soon became one of the most eloquent speakers in all Italy and, according to Aeneas Sylvius Piccolomini (the future Pope Pius II, 1458–64), he was listened to as another Paul.[2] About 1406

---

[1] *Acta Apost. Sedis.* Ser. II Vol. X No. 5 (May 15, 1943) 129–131. For an Engl. transl. cf. *Franc. Studies* XXV No. 1 (Mar. 1944) 3–6. Cf. also *Franciscan Herald and Forum* XXIII (March, 1944), No. 3, pp. 65–6.

[2] Cf. H. Sbaraglea, O. M. Conv., *Supplementum et Castigatio—ad Scriptores Trium Ord. S. Francisci a Waddingo aliisque conscriptos*, Rome, Editio Nardecchia, 1906, p. 137.

St. Vincent Ferrer,[3] while preaching at Alessandria in Piedmont, foretold that his mantle would descend upon one then listening to him, and said that he would indeed return to France and Spain, but leave to another (Bernardine) the task of evangelizing the remaining peoples of Italy.[4] He preached his first sermon Sept. 8, 1405, by order of Nicholas of Uzano.[5] The Feast Day of the Nativity of the Blessed Virgin Mary (Sept. 8) thus became an eventful day in the life of our saint.

He became so famous as a preacher that there was hardly a city which did not hear his voice.[6] In 1419 he traversed the Romagna, and the following year preached in Bergamo, Brescia, Verona, Vicenza and Venice. In 1423 he delivered sermons at Ferrara, Reggio, Modena, Bologna, Mantua, and throughout the Province of Lombardy; in 1424 at Prato; between 1424 and 1425 at Florence; during the month of May, 1425, in his home city of Siena;[7] in 1425 in Perugia;[8] in 1426 at Viterbo;[9] and in 1427 again at Florence, Siena, Assisi and the neighboring towns of Umbria and Rome.

His mission was one of peace. Everywhere he endeavored to suppress party and family strifes not only among seculars, but also among his own brethren. During his apostolic labors as preacher in Italy he dwelt as much in the convents of the Conventuals as in the hermitages of the Observants. Ludwig von Pastor calls him "one of the greatest saints and preachers of his age."[10] He is especially looked upon as the first and foremost itinerant missionary of the fifteenth century.

---

[3] Cf. *Amer. Eccles. Rev.*, Vol. CIX, No. 1 (Jan. 1941), p. 73.

[4] Cf. *Cath. Encyc.*, II, 505 c.

[5] "Hic cognita fratris Bernardini Senensis virtute, excellentia, sanctitate, insigni devotione, praeclara in divinis litteris eruditione, concionandi provinciam demandavit." Luke Wadding, O. F. M., *Annales Minorum* (*AM*), Quaracchi, 3rd. ed., 1931 ff., IX, 268.

[6] "Fiducia in Deo collocata, ibat per regiones et civitates, annunciabat hominibus virtutes et vitia, gloriam et poenas sempiternas. Tanta autem divinae gratiae largitate perfundebatur, ut diligeretur ab omnibus, ab omnibus et honoraretur et cum multa reverentia exciperetur et auscultaretur, haud secus atque quidam Christi Apostolus." *AM*, IX, 270, no. 8. Cf. also *American Eccles. Rev.*, Vol. 65 (1921), pp. 29–36; *AM* XII, 187–263.; *Franc. Studies*, XXIII, No. 1 (Mar. 1942), pp. 12–34.

[7] Cf. *Archivum Franciscanum Historicum* (*AFH*), VIII, 678.

[8] Cf. *Miscellanea Francescana*, (*MF*), I, 185.

[9] Cf. *MF* IV, 34–46.

[10] Pastor-Antrobus, *History of the Popes*, St. Louis, Herder, 1923, Vol. I, p. 232.

Conditions in Italy were such that at perhaps no other time was Christian oratory more needed nor more effective than during the fifteenth century. The "free and fervent exercise of this office [preaching] was one of the most cheering signs in an age clouded with many dark shadows," rightly concludes the great papal annalist;[11] whereas Jacob Burckhardt in *The Civilization of the Renaissance in Italy*, commenting on the effectiveness of the Renaissance preachers, says that they produced

> . . . a mighty impression which consisted chiefly in the awakening of the conscience. The sermons were moral exhortations, free from abstract notions and full of practical application, rendered more impressive by the saintly and ascetic character of the preacher, and by the miracles which, even against his will, the inflamed imagination of the people attributed to him. The most powerful argument used was not the threats of hell and Purgatory, but rather the living results of the *maledizione*, the temporal ruin wrought on the individual by the curse which clings to the wrongdoer. The grieving of Christ and the saints has its consequences in this life. And only thus could men sunk in passion and guilt be brought to repentence and amendment which was the chief object of the sermon.[12]

Among such potent preachers of the *quattrocento* were first of all "Bernardino da Siena and his two pupils, Alberto da Sarteano and Jacopo della Marca (St. James of the Marches), Giovanni Capistrano, Robert of Lecce, and finally Girolamo Savonarola."[13]

One of the means which St. Bernardine of Siena used, especially on the occasion of his sermons, to overcome the rampant evils of his day was the devotion to the Holy Name of Jesus,[14] "which he ever had upon his lips."[15] His success in converting the Roman people, who had grown wild and lawless during the absence of the popes from the

---

[11] Pastor-Antrobus, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, p. 33.

[12] New York, Boni Books, 1935, pp. 450–51.

[13] Burckhardt, *op. cit.*, p. 452. Concerning St. John Capistran, cf. Hofer-Cummins, *St. John Capistran, Reformer*, St. Louis, Herder, 1943.

[14] Cf. Mariotto Candido, O.F.M., *Il Nome di Gesu e i Francescani*, Rome, 1898; *Amer. Eccles. Rev.*, Vol. 64 (1921), p. 186; AFH III, 588 ff; XVII, 594–5; XXVIII, 443; XXIX, 142, 443; XXX, 170; XXV, 121; *Studi Francescani*, VII (1921), 227–35; *MF*, III, 160; IV, 150; *Antonianum*, (Rome), III, (1928), 65–86; Raphael M. Huber, O.F.M. Conv., "Franciscan Devotion to the Holy Name," in the *Addresses of the Holy Name Convention, in Baltimore, Md.*, Oct. 16, 1911 (New York: Bureau of the Holy Name Society, 1911). For the use of the emblem *I H S* cf. AFH XV, 260; XIV, 38 ff; *Cath. Hist. Rev.*, XV, 344–51.

[15] Roman Breviary, May 30.

Eternal City, was truly amazing. But a pure and saintly life gave double power to his words. Bloody feuds, which had lasted for years, were brought to an end; atonement was made for great crimes; and hardened sinners were converted. "On the 21st of June, 1424," writes the Secretary of the Senate, Infessura, "a great funeral pile of playing cards, lottery tickets, musical instruments, false hair, and other feminine adornments, was erected on the Capitol, and all these things were burned."[16] Owing, however, to his novel way of venerating the Holy Name, i.e., by means of a banner and wooden tablet bearing the inscription "I H S," he was accused of "idolatry to the golden Name of Jesus" before Pope Martin V (1417–31) in 1427. Bernardine was cited to Rome and a special commission was appointed to investigate and pass judgment upon his writings and sermons. This took place in St. Peter's Basilica, June 8, 1427, in the presence of the Pope. It must have been a deep source of humiliation to the saintly friar; but St. John Capistran defended his one-time master so admirably that Bernardine was not only acquitted, but, in order to exonerate the saint and to show his sympathy with Bernardine's preaching and devotion, Martin V personally took part in a procession in the Eternal City in honor of the Holy Name.[17] Perhaps the best vindication of Bernardine's devotion and method of spreading it was the permission granted to the Franciscans in 1530 to celebrate the "Feast of the Triumph of the Holy Name," which in 1722 was extended to the Church Universal.

In 1427, the same year that Bernardine was accused of heresy in Rome on account of his devotion to the Holy Name, Martin V pressed upon him the bishopric of Siena, but he refused, playfully remarking that the whole of Italy, due to his preaching apostolate, was his diocese. He also refused the Sees of Ferrara in 1431, and Urbino in 1437. Accusations were again proferred against the Saint in 1437, but Eugene IV (1431–47), his life-long friend, put an end to the attack against him by means of the Brief *Sedis Apostolicae*, dated Jan. 7, 1432.[18]

During nine months of this same year Bernardine was the steady companion of King Sigismund (1410–37), whom he accompanied to Rome in 1433 for his coronation as Emperor. In 1436 Bernardine resumed his missionary activities, but was obliged to omit them again in 1438 when he was appointed by the Minister General of the Franciscan Order, William of Casale (1430–42), his Vicar over the Observants. Eugene IV confirmed the appointment by a special letter dated Sept. 1, 1438.[19] Bernardine addressed a circular letter to all the brethren subject to his care.[20] It is modeled after the explanation of the Rule of St. Francis as given by Nicholas of Osimo, the Observant Vicar of the Province of St. Michael the Archangel (*S. Angeli* or *Monte Gargano*).[21] In it Bernardine explains certain matters pertaining to the obligation of observing the Rule and the moderate use of temporal goods in the spirit of the declarations of Popes Clement V, Nicholas III and Martin V. He exhorts the friars to submit in all things to the will of their Superiors, who are to decide all doubts in questions of controversy. The saint faithfully fulfilled the office enjoined upon him (1438–42), but always in subjection to and in union with the General. No one did more than he to restore regular discipline in the whole Order.

---

[16] Quoted by Pastor-Antrobus, *op. cit.*, I, 232–3.

[17] Cf. *AM* X, 113–114; *Analecta Francescana* (*AF*), Quaracchi, 1887, 278–9; Pastor-Antrobus, *op. cit.*, I, 232–4.

[18] Cf. *AM* X, 189; *Bullarium Franciscanum* (*BF*), *Nova Series* (*NS*), I, 27, (No. 40).

During the years of his Vicariate the Observant Family increased rapidly both in adherents and in monasteries.[22] He is said to have founded or reformed three hundred convents of the friars and to have increased the number of the Observants from 130 to 4,000, and their houses from 20 to 320.[23] Owing to this fact, St. Bernardine is often, though falsely, called the "Founder of the Observants," especially in Poland.[24]

In 1440 the saint, afflicted with sickness and old age, sought to resign his difficult office of Vicar General, but the Pope refused to accept his resignation and commanded him to continue in his official capacity. To facilitate matters, however, he did give Bernardine permission to select a *Socius* to whom he might confer such powers as he deemed useful to himself and expedient for the welfare of the Observant Family.[25] The saint made use of the privilege accorded him by selecting as his assistant St. John Capistran (1441), and by making him Visitator and Commissary of the Observant brethren in the Provinces of Genoa, Milan and Bologna.[26] The Pope himself appointed Santius de Canales Visitator and Custos of the Provinces of all the Reform Houses in Castile and Leon.[27]

---

[19] Cf. *AM* XI, 32; *BF* (*NS*) I, 177, (No. 385).

[20] Cf. *AM* XI, 102; *AF* II, 303.

[21] Cf. *AF* II, 300.

[22] Wadding in his *Scriptores Trium Ord. Fr. Minor.*, Rome, Edit. Nardecchia, 1906, p. 45, says of him that he was a "vir sanctissimus, et doctissimus, cui Familia Regularis Observantiae, si non exordium, saltem incrementum debet, et stabilitatem."

[23] Cf. *AF* II, 300.

[24] Cf. L. Palomes, *Dei Fratri Minori*, Palermo, 1897, p. 314. A numerous and growing congregation of Franciscan Sisters in this country bears his name. Cf. Maximum Poppy, O.F.M., *The Fruitful Ideal*, St. Louis, Herder, 1931, No. 27 (p. 47) Part II.

While advocating reform in the whole Order, Bernardine was always staunch opponent to any division in the Order; for which reason he was beloved by both Conventuals and Observants. He particularly enjoined upon the members of his charge to devote themselves to study, without which they could never properly discharge the duties of the Sacred Ministry imposed upon them by the Holy See.[28] Like St. Bonaventure, the Seraphic Doctor, and one time Minister General of the Order (1257–74), St. Bernardine was known for his spirit of kindness and understanding. He advised St. James of the Marches (who, with St. Bernardine himself, Bl. Albert of Sarteano, and St. John Capistran is looked upon as one of the "Four Pillars of the Observance") to treat his body less harshly ("*ut secum mitius aliquanto ageret*"). He and his associates did marvels for the reform of the Order in Italy.

After five years of faithful service, St. Bernardine, wearied of his difficult charge, requested the Pope anew to absolve him from office.[29] Eugene IV, taking compassion on the aged and sickly man, granted his wish. He was appointed (Titular) Guardian of Bethlehem and Provincial of the Holy Land. It is doubtful, though, if he ever went to Palestine. At the most he represented that Province at the General Chapter of Padua in 1443.

Relieved of his duties, he again resumed in 1443 his missionary labors. Eugene IV (it is asserted) addressed a letter to him requesting him to preach the Crusade against the Turks.[30] There is no historical evidence, however, that he ever put the decree in effect.

---

[25] Cf. *Multis saepe numero*, March 10, 1440, (*AM* XI, 100–101).

[26] Cf. *AM* XI, 137.

[27] Cf. *Apostolicae Servitutis*, June 28, 1441, (*AM* X, 413; *BF* (*NS*) I, 253, No. 524).

[28] Cf. *AM* XI, 126; Holzapfel, Her., O.F.M.—Haselbeck, *Manuale Historiae Ord. Fr. Min.*, Freiburg in Br., 1909, p. 254; *Collectanea Francescana* (*CF*), IV, 253.

[29] Cf. *AM* XI, 156.

[30] Cf. A. G. Ferrers Howell, *S. Bernardino of Siena*, London, Methuen, 1913, p. 199; F. Donati, "S. Bernardino predicatore delle Indulgenze per la Crociata" in *Bolletino Senese*, Siena, 1894, II, 130–36.

In 1444 Bernardine set out for Naples. He reached Aquila in a dying state. He asked to be taken to the convent of the Conventuals, where he breathed his last on Ascension Eve, May 20, 1444, at the age of 64, just as the friars were chanting the words of the Divine Office: "*Pater, manivestavi nomen tuum hominibus.*" He was at first buried in the Church of the Conventuals at Aquila. Due to the large number of miracles wrought through his intercession,[31] he was canonized May 24, 1450, only six years after his death, by Pope Nicholas V, while the Jubilee Year was being celebrated and while the friars were holding their General Chapter in the Eternal City.[32] On May 17, 1472, Bernardine's body was solemnly transferred to the new church of the Observants at Aquila[33] and enclosed in a costly shrine, the gift of Louis XI of France. The church, destroyed by an earthquake in 1703, was replaced by another edifice. It is interesting to note that the invading French soldiers rediscovered the saint's remains in 1799.

Like St. Bernard of Clairvaux, St. Bernardine of Siena overflowed with unction for things spiritual. His heart glowed when he spoke or wrote of the Passion of Christ, of the glories of His Blessed Mother[34] or of the virtues of peace, harmony and charity. Many claim that it was due to his example and influence that the pious practice of adding the name "Jesus" after the first part of the *Ave Maria*, following the words "blessed is the fruit of thy womb," was particularly popularized, even though the introduction itself seems to go back to the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries.[35] He also spread the devotion to St. Joseph, the Spouse of Mary, and fostered the "Franciscan Crown" or Rosary of the Seven Joys, consisting of 72 *Aves* (signifying the presumable number of years of Mary's life), seven *Our Fathers*, and an additional *Pater*, *Ave* and *Gloria* to be recited according to the intention of the Holy Father.

Due to his many writings, sermons, and expositions of the Sacred Scriptures, devotees of the Saint hope that some day Mother Church may find it feasible to declare St. Bernardine a Doctor of the Church.

---

[31] Cf. Pastor-Antrobus, *op. cit.*, II, 127, 129.

[32] Cf. *BF* (*NS*) I, No. 1364, (*Bulla Canonizationis*; cf. *ibid.* No. 895, 1056, 1069, 1268, 1345); Pastor-Antrobus, *op. cit.*, II, 79 ff.

[33] Cf. *AM* XIV, 6 ff; *MF* V, 92–94.

[34] One of his works was entitled *Salutationes ad Beatam Virginem* and began with the words: "Ave Maria, gratia plena, prophetis praedicta, signis praemonstrata." The original MS of this beautiful eulogy was at one time in the Cathedral Library of Seville. Cf. Sbaraglea, *Supplementum*, etc., *op. cit.*, p. 139.

[35] Cf. *Cath. Encyc.*, VII, 111 d.

A petition to that effect was directed to the Holy See by the General Chapter of the Friars Minor assembled in Rome in 1882.[36] This ardent desire of the admirers of St. Bernardine has inspired the literary men of the Order to make a renewed investigation concerning the authenticity of the works ascribed to the saint, to detect hitherto unknown tracts or sermons, and to publish in print many of his manuscripts still hidden away in the archives and libraries of Europe. It is to be hoped that this task will be accomplished soon, lest Christianity, through the ravages of war, earthquake, fire, and like calamities, be robbed of these treasures for all time.

LITERARY WORKS

Among the works ascribed to St. Bernardine, many are certainly authentic, others certainly spurious, others doubtful, others interpolated.[37] A complete and critical edition of his works is much needed and highly desirable.

St. Bernardine's writings were first collected and published at Lyons in 1501. The most important compilation to date is still the edition of his *Opera Omnia*, in five volumes, by J. de la Haye.[38] An excellent selection of Bernardine's ascetical works was issued by the late Cardinal Vives y Tuto, O.M.Cap., under the title *Sancti Bernardini Senensis de Passione, Resurrectione et SS. Nomine Jesu Contemplationes*, (Rome, 1903). Undoubtedly, his best preserved works are his sermons—full of unction and devotion—written, as they were delivered, in a popular style, many of them even incorporating the local dialect and parlance. They are replete with examples, similes and metaphors, much like those of the Saviour Himself, the greatest model of all sacred orators.

Bernardine's extant discourses can easily be divided into two categories: those written by himself in Latin, and those preached in the vernacular, of which we possess reports made by persons who had heard them delivered.[39] To the first classification belong his Lenten courses, his Advental courses, and those pertaining to the Blessed Virgin Mary, the Saints, or to special seasons of the year other than Lent and Advent. To the second belong his Lenten course preached at Florence during the Lent of 1442; a course of sermons delivered at Florence during the Lent of 1425; 45 sermons given at Siena in the Summer of 1427; a number of sermons preached at Amelia in 1426 (?) (of which a manuscript Latin summary exists in the Vatican Library, Codex No. 6966); and finally the 64 sermons "*De Evangelio Aeterno,*" which were published by De la Haye.[40] The forty-five Italian sermons delivered at Siena in 1427 and verbally transmitted by the scribe mentioned were published by L. Bianchi in three volumes at Siena between 1880 and 1888. The best available collection of Bernardine's sermons, however, still remains De la Haye's publication.

---

[36] Cf. *Cath. Encyc.*, II, 507 a.

[37] For a good, critical, and fairly complete list of *Bernardiana* cf. Wadding, *Scriptores* (*op. cit.*), p. 45; Sbaraglea, *Supplementum*, etc., (*op. cit.*), p. 137-140, to which the recent editors of the new edition as quoted, have added some pertinent remarks; cf. also Ferrers Howell, *op. cit.*, Chapter III and IV, p. 216-325, who bases his work on De la Haye's *Opera Omnia*; cf. also Pastor-Antrobus, *op. cit.*, I, 234, Note 2.

[38] Paris and Lyons, 1536, and 1650; Venice, 1745. Cf. Sbaraglea, *loc. cit.*, p. 137.

[39] Between Aug. 15 and Sept. 30, 1427, Bernardine preached forty-four Italian sermons at Siena and all were stenographically recorded *suo modo* by a Sienese

Like a joyful Franciscan troubadour, Bernardine frequently made use of Sienese gayety, and even of mimicry and jokes in his Italian sermons; but his Latin sermons, fashioned somewhat after the decadent Scholastic form of the fifteenth century, resemble formal dissertations with minute divisions and subdivisions. These were intended to serve as a guide to himself rather than for practical and actual delivery; they were the font from which he drew.

Besides his sermons Bernardine left a number of other writings: dissertations, essays, tracts, and letters on practical, ascetical, and mystical theology. Some of his homilies on the Gospels and Commentaries on the Apocalypse are used in the Breviary (Roman and Franciscan) on certain Feast Days of the Blessed Virgin, St. Joseph, etc. The editors of the *Archivum Franciscanum Historicum* are continually devoting many pages to the proper evaluation and exact publication of Bernardine's works and studies; printing many hitherto unedited tracts; and featuring photographic and photostatic reproductions, thus preparing the way for a future critical edition of his works. In 1936, for example, Fr. Benvenuto Bughetti, O.F.M., published twelve hitherto either neglected or totally unknown documents pertaining to the life of St. Bernardine.[41] Some of these had

---

by the name of Benedetto M. Bartolomeo. Cf. *MF* XIII, 157; N. Orlandi, *St. Bernardino de Siena: Fioretti,* Siena, 1911; Ferrers Howell, *op. cit.,* p. 223; Bargellini, Piero, "San Bernardino e il suo stenografo" in *Nuova Antologia* Anno 67, Fasc. 1458 (Dec. 16, 1932, Rome, Treves-Treccani. Concerning his *Prediche Volgari* cf. *Franc. Studies* XXV, No. 1 (Mar. 1944) 7–33.

[40] Cf. *Opera Omnia, op. cit.,* II, 418 Ferrers Howell, *op. cit.,* pp. 223–26.

[41] *Documenta inedita de S. Bernardino Senensi: 1430–1445, AFH* XXIX, 478–500.

indeed been published forty-three years previously by Fortunatus Donati[42] but they had never been sufficiently evaluated. Neither did Wadding refer to them in his *Annales Minorum*; nor even the editors of the new series of the *Bullarium Franciscanum*.[43] In the same *Archivum Franciscanum Historicum*, Fr. Anthony Fantozzi, O.F.M., published documents pertaining to St. Bernardine and referring to the city of Perugia where the saint devoted such a zealous apostolate.[44]

Reproductions of samples of autographed codices and manuscripts of the saint have also recently received much attention. The highly reliable Catholic *Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche*,[45] for example, devotes a full page to a facsimile reproduction of one of Bernardine's sermons now preserved in the original in the Vatican Library. Between 1934 and 1935 Fr. Dionisio Paschetti, O.F.M.,[46] published a list of a large number of autographed manuscripts found twenty-five days after the saint's death (1444) in his room in the Observant convent at Siena (Capriola) by a special commission, at the head of which stood the Guardian of the said convent. Among the nineteen manuscripts written personally by St. Bernardine, eight were sermons on diverse topics; the remaining eleven various tracts entitled, for example, *De B. Virgine, de Spiritu Sancto, de Beatitudinibus Evangelicis*; *de Passione Domini*; *de abusionibus* [*sic*] *artificum et mercatorum*; *de Christiana Religione*; *de octo beatitudinibus*; *Itinerarium anni* (or *sylva rerum* for sermons, etc.); *de contractibus et usuris*, tom. 6;[47] *de restitutione, contractibus et usuris*, and finally a *Summa diversarum rerum*, tom. 1.[48] Thereupon follows a detailed discussion of Bernardinian manuscripts in the Vatican Archives[49] with four full-page photographic reproductions of the manuscripts proper, either written by the saint or directed to him; for example, a Brief of Pope Eugene IV;[50] also a similar enumeration and evaluation of Bernardinian manuscripts in the Communal Library at Siena with four additional photographic reproductions.[51]

---

[42] "Notizie su S. Bernardino con un documento inedito," in *Bollettino Senese di Storia Patria*, I, Siena, 1894, pp. 42–76.

[43] Vol. I: 1431–1455, Quaracchi, 1929.

[44] Cf. *Documenta Perugina de S. Bernardino Senensi*, *AFH* XV, 103–154, 406–470.

[45] Vol. II, 214, Freiburg in Br., Herder, 1938.

[46] Cf. *AFH* XXVII and XXVIII; also *ibid.*, IX, 494–520 and *ibid.*, X, 161–188.

[47] Cf. Sbaraglea, *Suppl.*, *op. cit.*, p. 139.

[48] Cf. *AFH* XXVII, 231; Sbaraglea, p. 137–9. The frequent references to usury, disreputable practices by merchants and artists, contracts, etc., show not only Bernardine's legal mind (he was a graduate of the School of Law of Siena), but also that he was fully cognizant of the evils of his day, which he sought to remedy in the interest of the laboring classes and the poor by such institutions as the *Montes Pietatis* (*Monti di pietá*), cheap brokerages under Catholic charitable auspices. Cf. *Franciscan Studies*, Vol. 22, No. 3 (Sept. 1941) 3–28.

[49] Cf. *AFH* XXVII, 241 ff.

Bernardine's famous *Tractatus de Speculo Peccatorum, de Contemptu Mundi* is substantially a sermon setting forth the vanity of the world, the terrible condition of the damned, and the ineffable joys of heaven. It closes with a short exhortation to penance. It is known to have existed in two manuscripts, one preserved in the Library of the Cathedral of Metz (No. 200); and the other in the library of the Cathedral of Seville.[52] Fortunately it is included in De la Haye's *Opera Omnia*, Vol. III, 437–440.[53]

Other famous tracts of Bernardine (since De la Haye's collection refers primarily to his sermons) and once published, are his *Commentary on the Apocalypse*, written between 1427 and 1428.[54] His *Quadragesimale de religione christiana*, which once belonged in manuscript form to Prosper Lambertini (the later Pope Benedict XIV, 1740–58), was first published at Basle, *circa* 1490; and again at Lyons, *circa* 1498; his *Sermones de Evangelio Aeterno* were first published at Spires in 1484; later at Basle, *circa* 1490 and in 1498 (*in folio*); his *Sermones de B. M. V.* were published in 1493; whereas his *Sermo de Gloriosa Virgine Maria* appeared (*in quarto*) at Cologne *circa* 1472–75.[55] His *Speculum Peccatorum* was published (*in quarto*) at Rome during the fifteenth century (exact date not given); his *Tractatus de contractibus et usuris* (*in folio*) at Strasbourg *circa* 1475; his *Tractatus de Vita Christiana in tres sermones divisus*, (*in quarto*), at Utrecht, *circa* 1475; and finally his *Opus de Confessione* (*in quarto*) in Italian at Venice *circa* 1494.[56] Besides the manuscripts found in his room after his death (and he did have a rather sizable library) there were found many other relics.[57] A Breviary used by the saint, the seal of his office as Franciscan Vicar General, and a pair of eye glasses belonging to him are today preserved in the Communal Library of Siena.[58]

---

[50] Cf. *ibid.*, between pp. 248–9.

[51] Cf. *AFH* XXVII, 252 ff; 500.

[52] Cf. Sbaraglea, *Supplem.*, *op. cit.*, p. 138.

[53] I say "fortunately" because if the lovers of *Bernardiniana* do not take immediate steps to publish the remaining unprinted MSS of St. Bernardine of Siena, these valuable documents, due to present wars, invasions and destructions of artistic and historical monuments may be lost to posterity.

[54] Ferrers Howell, *op. cit.*, p. 304.

[55] Since all these publications are incunabula one can readily perceive not only their present value but also conclude that since the sermons and tracts were published in so many different places, St. Bernardine must have been held in the highest esteem throughout the then Catholic world (XV cent.) as a preacher, writer, and expounder of the Sacred Scriptures.

[56] Cf. Sbaraglea, *Supplem.*, *op. cit.*, p. 140; Ferrers Howell, *op. cit.*, p. 315 ff.

BIOGRAPHIES OF ST. BERNARDINE

Much has been done in recent years to prepare a critical biography of the saint. In 1931 Bernard Stasiewski (a young Licentiate in Sacred Theology) published a study of the various sources regarding the life of St. Bernardine.[59] Commenting on this study, the Capuchin, P. Emeric of Isegen, while defending the author from a rather harsh criticism received from a certain critic, augments his list by adding a detailed study of the saint's activities at Pavia, Viterbo, Perugia and Verona.[60] In 1906 the well-known Jesuit Bollandist, Van Ortroy, S.J. published a *Vie inédite de St. Bernardin de Sienne*,[61] supplementing the already excellent biography in the *Acta Sanctorum Boll.* for May 20. In 1912 Fr. Serafino Gaddoni, O.F.M., published a hitherto unprinted *Life* of the saint written in 1450, the very year of his canonization.[62] Most important remain, nevertheless, the bibliographical notices on the saint given by Wadding in his *Annales Minorum*;[63] in his *Scriptores Trium Ord. Fr. Min.*,[64] and by Sbaraglea in his *Supplement* to Wadding's *Scriptores*.[65] The same naturally applies to all the Papal documents in which the name of St. Bernardine figures, for example, those of Pope Martin V (1417–31) published by Conrad Eubel, O.F.M. Conv., in the *Bullarium Franciscanum*,[66] and those of Eugene IV (1431–1447) published recently by Fr. Ulrich Hüntemann, O.F.M. in a new series of the same *Bullarium*.[67] A beautiful illustrated *Life* of St. Bernardine was recently published in Italian by Fr. (now Bishop)

---

[57] Cf. *AFH* XXVII, 226 ff.

[58] Cf. *AFH* I, 178.

[59] *Der hl. Bernardine von Siena. Untersuchung über die Quellen seiner Biographien*, (Münster in W., 1931). For divergent criticisms of this work cf. *AFH* XXV, 280–2; *CF* VII (1933), p. 116–7; and *Revue Hist. Eccles.*, XXVIII (1932), 388–9.

[60] *CF* VII, (1933), 116–7.

[61] *Analecta Bollandiana*, Brussels, 1906, Tom., XXV, 304–388. Cf. *AFH* II, 33, and XXIX, 421 ff.

[62] *Vita inedita di San. Bernardino*, Arezzo, 1912. Cf. *MF* IV, 146–150.

[63] Vol. IX, 27 ff; 252 ff; 268, No. 4. Cf. also Vols. X and XI *passim*.

[64] *Op. cit.*, Vol. I, 43.

[65] *Op. cit.*, Vol. II, Part I, 137–140.

[66] Vol. VII Quaracchi, 1904.

[67] Vol. I, (*NS*), Quaracchi, 1929.

Vittorino Facchinetti, O.F.M.[68] An important contemporary source of the activities of the saint is the biography written by his faithful and zealous disciple, St. John Capistran, published in J. de la Haye's *Opera Omnia* (Part I); the official *Acts* of the saint's canonization[69] and the works and writings of other contemporaries, for example, Aeneas Sylvius (Pius II), a great admirer of St. Bernardine.[70]

Much literature of late has also been devoted to the main phases of the saint's activities, for example, to his preaching apostolate. The famous German author of the classical *Konziliengeschichte*, Dr. Karl Hefele, found time to evolve a learned study on St. Bernardine and the Franciscan method of preaching in Italy during the fifteen century, based on Florentine and Sienese manuscripts.[71] It was very highly praised by the acute and capable critic and connaisseur of *Franciscana*, Fr. Michael Bihl, O.F.M., as a work done "*erudite, serene, grateque*" and as adding to Bernardinian studies a "*pretium, valoremque duraturum*."[72] A similar study by Theodor Zachariae expatiates on the medieval superstitions, opinions and practices denounced by St. Bernardine during the course of his wanderings throughout Italy.[73] Undoubtedly, the best of modern biographies of our saint is that by Paul Thureau-Dangin of the French Academy which likewise specializes on the preaching apostolate of Bernardine.[74] Extracts from the vivid sermons of the saint were edited by N. Orlandi,[75] whereas the *Examples of St. Bernardine* (his *Itinerarium*) were recently translated into English by A. Howe.[76] Perhaps the best present-day Capuchin connaisseur of *Bernardiniana* is Fr. Emeric of Isegem. In 1935 he devoted six pages of the Capuchin quarterly, the *Collectanea Fran-*

---

[68] *S. Bernardino da Siena, Mistico Sole del Secolo XV*, Milan, Casa Edit. S. Lega Eucharistica, 1933 *in quarto*, xxiv–612 pp. For a review cf. *CF* IV, (1934), 252–5.

[69] *BF* (*NS*), I, p. 910.

[70] Cf. Sbaraglea, *Supplem.*, I, 137.

[71] *Der hl. Bernhardin von Siena und die Franziskanische Wanderpredigt in Italien waerend des XV Jahrhunderts*, Freiburg in Br., 1912. Cf. *AFH* VI, 344–6.

[72] *AFH* VI, 344.

[73] "Aberglaübische Meinungen und Gebräuche des Mittelalters in den Predigten Bernardinos von Siena," in *Zeitschrift des Vereins für Volkskunde*, Vol. XXII, 113–134, 225–244, Berlin, Behrend & Co., 1912; cf. *AFH* VI, 344, 347.

[74] *Un prédicateur populair dans l'Italie de la Renaissance: S. Bernardin de Sienne*, Paris, 1926; Italian transl. 1897; German transl. 1904; English Transl. 1904.

[75] Siena, 1920.

[76] London, 1926.

cescana (published at Assisi) to an evaluation of popular and other sermons of the saint published by modern authors.[77]

The present centenary will undoubtedly add many more praiseworthy biographies and studies to the already growing amount of *Bernardiniana* in all modern languages.[78] Among the best works available in English on St. Bernardine of Siena are: the translation of Thureau-Dangin's *Life*; studies by Maisie Ward,[79] by A. G. Ferrers Howell,[80] and by Amadeo Maria, O. S. F. Obs., the last being entitled *Life of S. Bernardine of Siena, Minor Observantine.*[81]

Like his seraphic father, St. Francis of Assisi, and his co-nationalist, St. Catherine of Siena, St. Bernardine still remains one of the most beloved of Italian saints. Here in America, a city, a county, a mountain, a mountain range, and numerous churches and chapels bear his name. He has ever been a popular figure and model for painters, sculptors and artists. He was a favorite of the plastic artist in terra cotta, Della Robbia. Perhaps the best series of pictures of his life is that by Pinturicchio at *Ara Coeli*, Rome,[82] while the carved reliefs of the Oratory of Perugia, built in 1461 by the Magistrates of that once faction-torn city in gratitude for Bernardine's efforts for peace and concord among them, are considered to be some of the lovliest productions of Renaissance art.[83] A beautiful painting of the saint adorns the office of the *Maestro della Camera* in the Vatican. St. Bernardine looks down complacently as the Secretary issues the coveted *billeto* of admission to the august presence of the Vicar of Him, whose Holy Name he so revered and for the defense of which he too once appeared before two Popes.

Washington, D. C. RAPHAEL M. HUBER, O. F. M. CONV.

---

[77] Cf. *CF* V, 623–9.

[78] For additional literature on St. Bernardine not specifically mentioned in this article cf. *Cath. Encyc.*, II, 507 b, article by Fr. (now his Excellency, the Apostolic Nuncio to Ireland) Paschal Robinson, O.F.M.; *Lexikon f. Theol. u. Kirche*, II, 215–6; *Dict. de la Théol. Cath.*, II, 787–91; *AFH* V, (1912), 99–100, 581; VI, (1913), 76–90; XI, (1918), 399–441; XII, (1919), 187–263; XV, (1922), 103–154, 406–475; *MF* IV, V, and VI *passim*; Chevalier, *Répertoir des Sources Historiques. Bio-Bibl.*, I, 2, p. 569 ff; Stephen J. Brown, S.J., *An International Index of Cath. Biographies*, London, Burns Oates & Washbourne, 1935, p. 58.

[79] *St. Bernardino; the Peoples Preacher*, London. The Manresa Press, 1914.

[80] Cf. *supra.*, Note 30.

[81] London. Washbourne, 1873, in the "Oratorian Lives" series.

[82] Cf. Ferrers Howell, *op. cit.*, pp. 208, 348.

[83] For one of the reproductions cf. Ferrers Howell, *op. cit.*, p. 342.

THE PRIEST AT THE CHURCH DOOR

Things can and do happen at the door of the church which make it a fruitful place to do good for the souls of men. It was at one of the Temple entrances that Christ observed the poor widow dropping her mite into the treasury, and spoke those words that through the ages have touched tender chords in the hearts of men and inspired millions to follow the widow's example. It was at the Temple gate, called Beautiful, that Peter and John encountered the beggar, lame from birth, and worked the first miracle in an apostolate that was rich in miracles. It was there too, in Solomon's Porch, that Peter preached his inspiring discourse appealing to that same miracle to prove Christ's claims.

Now neither of these two events proves a divine institution or even approbation of an apostolate at the church door. Doubtless it was the merest coincidence that Christ and His Apostles met the poor and needy, and rendered them service at a temple gate. But many a priest can testify it is no coincidence that he meets the poor and needy at the door of his church and renders them his service. Though there may be no particular divine sanction for such an apostolate, still there are abundant natural indications that the loving charity of Christ is there dispensed in a way pleasing to God and profitable for immortal souls.

The idea of the apostolate at the church door might be expressed most simply by setting down its one brief rule: let the priest be there at the door of the church every Sunday before and after each of the Masses. The implication is let him be ready for almost anything to happen. He will find that things can and do happen there; to himself, to his parishoners, to his parish, provided of course, he skillfully directs the happenings in the right channel. Souls will profit, God's glory will be promoted, the spirit of charity will grow and bear abundant fruit.

One naturally seeks solid cogent reasons for undertaking a new and difficult assignment of this sort in addition to the other duties already pressing upon priests, consuming time and energy. Experience, however, often proves the apostolate is an efficient means of discharging a number of small duties, thus in the long run saving time and energy.

Pius XI is often said to have urged priests to go to the workingman, to go to the poor. The priest at the church door need not go abroad seeking the workingman and the poor; he meets them right at his own doorstep. They are happy and eager to come to him, to meet him, because he is easily accessible. Among other things they may tell him of their last labor-union meeting or one to be held, all in a few words. Those few words will open the priest's eyes to some of the labor problems his people are facing. They will give him not only direct access to the hearts of these men, but also personal experience, light and interest in the social question.

As a result of personal contact a priest will also find a notable increase in the friendliness and loyalty of parishoners. Business and industry know that nothing can supply for the personal touch in dealings between management and employees. Everything can be furnished the workers, good wages, favorable working conditions, security; but if management never praises, never blames, never has any direct dealings with employees, the almost perfect system will break down. The same condition can easily be duplicated in a parish. It may be well organized for the spiritual, intellectual, social and material welfare of its members, but the lack of the personal touch makes all of this cold, formal, official. The priests see and recognize their people every Sunday, but with the rail separating them. The faithful appreciate the sermons from the pulpit; they would treasure still more a friendly greeting at the front door. At social functions of the parish the priests may mix in a most friendly way with all present. But what of the many who never attend these functions? Study club meetings offer even a greater difficulty, since their attendance is still more restricted. At the door of the church the personal touch between priests and people may be more easily developed.

There is hardly a parish in the land without its quota of those who ring the rectory bell with fear and trembling. With such timid souls the apostle at the church door will become acquainted. He may even meet one so timid that he would die without the sacraments, if he himself had to summon the priest. After a while even the worst lose their timidity, grow quite friendly, even ask a small favor, or tender a Mass offering with "I've been wanting to give you this but was afraid to be bothering you, Father."

There is another fairly large group of pious unassuming persons whose only contact with the parish church is the early Mass on Sunday morning. These otherwise never meet their priest except on the occasion of the parish visitation. Incidentally the work at the church door can make the parish visitation much more effective. As a matter of fact, the apostolate is the easiest way of getting acquainted with parishioners, a duty incumbent on all priests in parishes.

Another who welcomes the weekly greeting from the priest as a life-saver is the new convert. The period of instruction over, the first fervor of reception into the Church having worn thin, he looks with hungry eye for a friendly face in crowds pouring out of the church on Sunday morning. Often faith that may be wavering from mere loneliness will receive new strength when at the church door the convert is greeted by the priest, and introduced to other members of the congregation. They appreciate help in the trying experience of socially joining the members of the Church after they have joined the Church itself.

Then there are the newcomers in the parish, not as lonely as the converts, but still hoping for an easy and quick welcome. They will be grateful to the apostle at the church door for extending the hand of fellowship. No doubt at all the priest, on his side, gains by meeting the newcomers.

The final and most cogent reason for taking up such an apostolate is that Christ Himself acted that way. He was accessible to the multitudes both before and after His sermons and public appearances. Thus immediately after the Sermon on the Mount "great crowds followed Him" and a leper presented himself pleading to be made clean (Matt. 8:1). Again, "And Jesus was going about all Galilee, teaching in their synagogues, and preaching the gospel of the kingdom, and healing every disease and sickness among the people" (Matt. 4:23), —which indicates that His teaching and healing went hand in hand. His public appearances brought Him in close personal contact with the people. True, Christ had no rectory to which He could retire after His preaching, but rectory or no rectory, His whole spirit was to make Himself easily accessible to men at all times.

This is no easy task for priests already burdened with many duties. To stand at the door of the church Sunday after Sunday in all kinds of weather, before and after every Mass, is a "grind," to say the least. It takes on an even more forbidding aspect when one considers he must have a smile and cheerful greeting ready for all who happen along. Answering questions, some quite foolish, rendering services that do not evoke too much gratitude, going into the confessional to hear a stray penitent will surely try one's patience. But the apostle soon learns to defend himself diplomatically against the bores, to make quick decisions and to postpone other affairs to a more convenient time.

If one desires a model to study or wishes to learn how to make the soft answer, let him page through the New Testament. There he will see how Christ dealt with similar situations. To have an intense discussion with the Pharisees on divorce interrupted by mothers bringing their children for a blessing will not fall to the priest's lot, but it gives an inkling of the trials of Christ's apostolate among simple people and how He met them.

These apostles of the church door, numerous though they may be, still for the most part remain unknown. They and their work are not flashy enough for the feature writers. The apostolate does not bring fame or a great name. There is one priest, for example, who for twenty-five years has kept his faithful stand at the church door. Many a story he tells of interesting, trying, profitable, novel, disheartening experiences. Often the last chapter of his story tells of the reconciling of a sinner long absent from the sacraments, of the reclaiming of those who were lost to the Church, of the validating of a marriage. The great good accomplished repaid him for his trying experiences, so he intends to continue the work as long as he is able.

There was another church-door apostle whose fidelity prompted news-writers at his death to praise him as the familiar figure at the door of the church, whose white hair and benign countenance drew hearts instinctively. Another of their remarks might almost serve as an epitaph: he knew and greeted every parishioner and made the stranger feel at home. Finally another of the apostolate found that, among other things, his presence at the church door cut down the number of late-comers to almost nothing. That surely was a worthwhile accomplishment.

St. Marys, Kansas. PATRICK M. REGAN, S.J.

APOLOGETICS IN THE SECOND CENTURY

The second century was one of the most critical periods in the Church's history. During this period she was not only forced to check the onslaughts of formidable and relentless enemies from without; she was beset by persistent enemies from within the fold. These internal enemies were the Judeo-Christians, the Gnostics, and the Montanists, all of whom professed to be Christians yet attempted to force upon the Church unchristian teachings and practices.

The Judeo-Christians, who are also known as Judaizers, tried to make Christian practices adhere to the prescriptions of Mosaic Law and to continue the Levitical worship in the Temple at Jerusalem, which they wanted to be the moral center of the Church. This group, made up chiefly of converts from the Pharisees, occasioned the First General Council at Jerusalem. Undaunted by the adverse decision of that council, the Judeo-Christians stubbornly held their ground and gradually developed into various heretical sects, such as, for instance, the Ebionites.

A far greater danger to the young Church was the intellectual movement known as Gnosticism. This movement developed from a tendency of religious-minded Christians to give a philosophical explanation of the mysteries of the Christian religion. The tendency would have been orthodox had faith been given its proper place; but when the Gnostics substituted reason for faith and supplanted faith by "*Gnosis*" (knowledge) they fell into the pitfall of heresy. It took the genius of St. Irenaeus to sound the death-knell of Gnosticism.

In the third quarter of the second century the Church was disturbed by a self-styled prophet, Montanus, who pretended to restore the charismatic gifts which had been so abundant in the first century. Montanus, who called himself the mouthpiece of the Holy Ghost, claimed to voice the third and last Revelation, which was to complete the Revelation of Jesus Christ. He instilled into the minds of his ardent followers the imminence of the Second Coming of Christ, and exhorted them to practice many austerities. Although Montanism split into several varying rigoristic sects, it did not entirely disappear until the sixth century.

These so-called internal enemies of the Church, viz., the Judeo-Christians, the Gnostics, and the Montanists, threatened the unity of the Christian Church in the second century. However, the Church's very existence was threatened in this same period by its external enemies who used every known human means to bring about the extermination of Christianity. The external enemies of the Church at this time were the Jews and the pagans. The Jews, who opposed the Church from its very beginning, accused the Christians principally on three counts: first, of believing that a crucified criminal was the Messias prophesied in the Jewish sacred scriptures, (whereas, the Jews claimed, the true Messias has not yet made Himself manifest to the world);[1] second, that, since Christianity stemmed from Judaism, Christians, faithful to their origin, should have observed the precepts of the Jewish Law, such as circumcision, sanctification of the Sabbath, etc.;[2] third, that the Christians professed a false doctrine by denying the God of the Patriarchs Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob.[3]

This Jewish hostility was reflected in and, in a way, was the cause of the hostile attitude of the pagans towards the Christians—a hostility that led to the bloody persecutions of the second century.

The pagan accusations against the Christians were of a three-fold character, religious, political, and moral. From a religious viewpoint the pagans, especially the Romans, considered the Christians impious and atheistic because they would not frequent the pagan temples, give honor to the state gods, or attend pagan religious festivities (to which were often attached acts of immorality). The political accusation was that of failure in good citizenship, because Christians were said to be subjects of "another kingdom." The moral incriminations against the Christians especially showed the ingenuity of the Romans in reconstructing in their minds scenes of which they knew little more than nothing. These were the charges of infanticide, cannibalism, and incest. The Christian tendency to conceal the mysteries, especially that of the Eucharistic celebration, from the uninitiated—the "*Disciplina Arcani*"—probably encouraged these charges. The pagans had heard vague rumors of what happened at the Eucharistic assemblies,—rumors of Christians eating bread that was someone's flesh and drinking his blood, and they reconstructed the spectacle in this fashion: a live infant was carried into the meeting place and then was concealed in flour. A neophyte, furnished with a club, was ordered to beat the lump of flour. Thus the infant was beaten to death and its blood was tasted by the initiated and its flesh eaten.[4] In this way the Christians, said the pagans, were guilty of infanticide and anthropophagy. This is the celebrated accusation of the "*Coenae Thyesteae.*" The charge of incest (*Concubitus Oedipodeus*) may also be traced to the Discipline of the Secret. The pagans had heard that the Christians were known by their love for one another, that they called one another 'brother' and 'sister,' and that at the Eucharistic banquet a 'kiss of peace' was given. Consequently, these infidels, with such thoughts in mind, and conscious of what took place at their own religious celebrations, accused the Christians of all sorts of immorality, chiefly that of incest.[5]

---

[1] Cf. St. Justin Martyr, *Dialogue with Trypho*, cap. 10.

[2] Cf. *Acts*, chap. 15; St. Justin Martyr, *loc. cit.*

[3] Cf. St. Justin Martyr, *op. cit.*, cap. 11.

[4] Cf. Minucius Felix, *Octavius*, cap. 9.

To defend the Church and to answer the above-described accusations of the Jews and pagans Divine Providence raised up a group of men known now as the Apologists of the Second Century. These Apologists were Quadratus, Aristides, Aristo of Pella, Justin, Tatian, Athenagoras, Theophilus of Antioch, Miltiades, Apollinaris of Hierapolis, Melito of Sardis, Hermias, Apollonius, Minucius Felix, Tertullian, and the unknown author of the *Epistle to Diognetus.*

Unfortunately we do not possess all the writings of these early champions of the Catholic faith. In fact, none of the works of almost half the Apologists are extant; while of the rest of the Apologists we have not even half the works.[6] However, from their extant works we can form a clear idea of the method the Apologists followed in answering the incriminations of both Jew and pagan. Special emphasis was placed on the replies to the pagans because, due to their number and influence, they constituted the bulk of the opposition to the Christian Church.

Most of the writings against the Jews were composed in the form of dialogues[7] in which the Apologists answered the Jewish objections by insisting that the Old Testament has been superseded by the New;

---

[5] Cf. *ibid.*

[6] It is encouraging to know that discoveries of the Apologists' writings are still being made. Thus the *Apology* of Aristides was discovered in 1889 at St. Catherine's on Mt. Sinai by the American scholar J. Rendel Harris. A work by Melito of Sardis entitled *On the Passion* came to light in 1940 among the papyri obtained from Egypt by A. C. Beatty and the University of Michigan. (Cf. Edgar J. Goodspeed, *A History of Early Christian Literature,* Chicago, The University of Chicago Press, 1942, p. 184.)

[7] Thus St. Justin's *Dialogue with Trypho* and Aristo of Pella's *Disputation between Jason and Papiscus concerning Christ.*

that the prescriptions of the Old Law were but figures or types of the New Law; and that Jesus of Nazareth is the true Messias because in Him were verified all the Messianic prophecies of the Old Testament.[8]

The apologies against the pagans were often written in the form of open letters or exhortations, addressed sometimes to the Emperor or Senate, sometimes to the people in general or to one person in particular.[9] The general theme of these apologies was an invitation to the pagan world to consider the genuine teachings and practices of the Christians before condemning them, *"ne ignorata damnetur."*[10] The Apologists replied to the pagan charges by denying them emphatically and by showing how the crimes of which they were accused were in direct opposition to Christian principles. The Christians, they pointed out, believed in One God, and therefore were not atheists; they observed such a rigorous code of morality that they abhorred the very mention of sins like infanticide or incest.[11] But the pagans, continued the Apologists, were guilty of the self-same crimes of which they accused the Christians, and of many others, such as idolatry.[12]

The work of the Apologists was not only defensive, as the name Apologist might imply; but it was also expository, for they were not satisfied with merely answering the false charges of their opponents in order to win toleration for the Christian Church, but they had taken on the added task of proving the truth of Christianity and thus aiding in its diffusion throughout the world. Many of the Apologists had been philosophers before their conversion;[13] they continued to wear the philosopher's robe when they became Christians and to employ philosophy to prove the divine origin of Christianity. To accomplish this they emphasized in their writings those points where Christianity and pagan wisdom coincided.

---

[8] Cf. St. Justin Martyr, *op. cit.*, cap. 11.

[9] St. Justin's *First Apology* begins with the words: "To the Emperor Titus Aelius Adrianus Antoninus Pius Augustus Caesar, and to his son Verissimus the Philosopher, and to Lucius the Philosopher, the natural son of Caesar and the adopted son of Pius, a lover of learning, and to the Sacred Senate with the whole people of the Romans; I, Justin, the son of Priscus and the grandson of Bacchius, natives of Flavia Neapolis in Palestine, present this address and petition in behalf of those of all nations who are unjustly hated and wantonly abused, myself being one of them." St. Theophilus of Antioch addressed his apology to Autolycus, a pagan who scorned the Christians.

[10] Cf. Tertullian, *Apologeticus*, cap. 1.

[11] Cf. Aristides, *Apology*, cap. 15–16; also Tertullian, *op. cit.*, cap. 39.

[12] Cf. Athenagoras, *Legatio*, cap. 34; also Minucius Felix, *op. cit.*, cap. 30.

[13] Among the Apologists who had been philosophers were Quadratus, Aristides, Justin Martyr, Athenagoras and Hermias.

The Apologists, therefore, were the first to attempt to effect harmony between revelation and reason. In other words, they were the pioneers in the field that was later to develop into the science of Apologetics. The principles of Apologetics laid down by these early defenders of the Catholic faith can still be used today with great profit. So close were these Fathers to the origins of Christianity and so faithfully do they re-echo the Apostolic teaching that today their words are of extraordinary value in the eyes of inquiring non-Catholics. Consequently their writings should hold a high place in the field of Apologetics. Although their work was primarily apologetical in character, yet, despite their own faulty theological terminology, the Apologists did lay the ground work for much of the later theological speculation. In a positive way the Apologists' principal task was to show that, whereas paganism failed to do so, Christianity did give the true answers to the ultimate problems of man's origin and destiny. History has shown how well the Apologists performed their task.

Philadelphia, Pa. THOMAS B. FALLS.

WHAT IS OUR REAL CATHOLIC POPULATION?

The study contained in these pages aims at establishing an estimate of the Catholic population in the United States as of 1940. The year 1940 has been selected to avoid the difficulties involved in estimating any war-time population.

There have been similar estimates made of the Catholic population in the past, but no one who is familiar with the science of population has ever for a moment considered these estimates reliable. The reason for the doubt is very simple. The lack of scientific research in the field of Catholic population has forced those who sought to determine its size to rely on unsatisfactory sources.

Population experts have always had the "hunch" that there are more Catholics in the United States than previous estimates would indicate. We need not develop here the reasoning in support of this contention. Nevertheless, reliable reports from Catholic chaplains tell us that the armed forces contain a larger proportion of Catholics than the structure of the Catholic population would seem to warrant. The present study was undertaken to discover whether or not this "hunch" is true.

The usual method of determining the size of a population, especially when other methods cannot be employed, is to use birth and death rates. Consequently, in this study we have based our estimate of the Catholic population on the number of infant baptisms (which we presume are equivalent to Catholic births) and on the number of Catholic deaths, as they are reported in the *Catholic Directory*. We cannot vouch for the reliability of these figures in each and every diocese, yet in view of the fact that they are required by the Code of Canon Law, they can reasonably be considered to be substantially accurate.

To become more specific, how is it possible to determine the size of a population on the basis of birth and death rates? The birth rate is the number of people born per thousand of the population, while the death rate is the number of people who have died per thousand of the population. These are called *crude* rates. Hence, if twenty children are born for every thousand people, the crude birth rate is 20; and if ten people die for every thousand in the population, the crude death rate is 10. Therefore, if 100 children are born in a certain community which has a crude birth rate of 20, the *birth rate population* of that community would be 5000; in like manner, if 50 people die in that community which has a crude death rate of 10, the *death rate population* would be 5000. It is evident, therefore, that two things are necessary in order to determine the size of any population: the number of births and deaths and the birth and death rate.

When we come, however, to estimate the size of the Catholic population, we find one of these requisites lacking. We know the number of Catholic births and deaths in every diocese in one year, but we do not know the size of the Catholic birth and death rate. Therefore, if we are to estimate the size of the Catholic population, we must supply a birth and death rate for Catholics. The only known birth rate and death rate, and consequently the only ones we can apply to Catholics are the birth rate and death rate of the general population. These are not going to be national rates, nor even state rates, but the birth and death rate of the diocesan area.

But is it valid to assume that the birth and death rates for the general population in a diocesan area can be applied to Catholics? After all, have not Catholics always had a birth rate greatly in excess of the birth rate of the general population? Whatever may have been true in the past, this objection to our assumption is answered by the opinion of population experts, Catholic and non-Catholic, that at the present time there is not a large difference between Catholic and non-Catholic birth rates. It is significant that in the period 1930–1940 Catholic elementary schools suffered a decline of 250,000 in registration, the first such decline in our history, in spite of the fact that three hundred additional schools were opened in that decade.

There is no denying, therefore, that the Catholic birth rate has declined in recent years, so that now it approximates the non-Catholic birth rate. But even if it is still slightly higher, it is not much higher, so that our assumption remains substantially valid, and we can legitimately apply the birth rate (and the death rate) of the general population to Catholics.

With the two requirements for estimating the Catholic population satisfied, viz., the number of Catholic births and deaths and an adequate birth and death rate, we were able to estimate the size of the Catholic population on a diocesan, regional, and national scale. The tables 1 and 2 contain these estimates.

TABLE 1

DIOCESAN, REGIONAL, AND NATIONAL ESTIMATE OF THE CATHOLIC POPULATION

Dioceses	Reported		Estimated Rates		Estimated Population			Per Cent of Area Catholic
	Births*	Deaths	Birth Rate	Death Rate	Catholic Directory	Birth Rate Population	Death Rate Population	
								%
North East:								
Portland (Me.)	5,182	2,227	18.6	12.5	195,000	279,000	178,000	21-35
Burlington (Vt.)	2,468	1,116	19.2	12.9	111,000	129,000	87,000	25-38
Manchester (N. H.)	3,565	1,908	17 5	12.7	171,000	204,000	150,000	30-40
Springfield (Mass.)	12,400	7,403	15.0	12.3	498,000	827,000	632,000	60-80
BOSTON (Mass.)	28,959	13,978	15.7	11.8	1,500,000	1,845,000	1,166,000	50-65
Fall River (Mass.)	4,168	2,354	15.0	12.3	197,000	278,000	191,000	47-70
Hartford (Conn.)	19,786	6,892	14.8	10.6	633,000	1,337,000	650,000	38-78
Providence (R. I.)	6,912	4,271	15.3	11.2	348,000	452,000	381,000	55-63
Ogdensburg (N. Y.)	3,142	1,544	19.6	12.8	109,000	160,000	120,000	37-50
Albany (N. Y.)	5,171	3,650	14.9	13.2	243,000	347,000	277,000	29-36
NEW YORK (N. Y.)	28,892	13,172	14.4	11.4	1,004,000	2,000,000	1,155,000	25-42
Syracuse (N. Y.)	6,005	2,872	16.5	12.4	204,000	366,000	234,000	28-42
Rochester (N. Y.)	4,630	2,589	15.1	12.6	230,000	306,000	206,000	22-32
Buffalo (N. Y.)	9,630		16.4	11.6	392,000	587,000	(400,000)	30-45
Brooklyn (N. Y.)	27,802	11,154	14.0	9.0	962,000	1,986,000	1,239,000	29-42
Paterson (N. J.)	2,856	1,254	14.1	11.2	121,000	225,000	112,000	24-50
NEWARK (N. J.)	16,024	6,830	14.4	10.4	645,000	1,113,000	657,000	37-61
Trenton (N. J.)	4,837	2,015	14.8	12.1	223,000	327,000	167,000	20-37
Camden (N. J.)	2,772	1,168	15.1	12.4	111,000	183,000	94,000	17-30
Erie (Pa.)	3,605	1,733	19.4	11.7	143,000	186,000	148,000	20-23
Scranton (Pa.)	7,735	4,266	17.3	11.6	357,000	447,000	368,000	35-43
PHILADELPHIA (Pa.)	21,720	11,645	15.6	11.9	872,000	1,392,000	979,000	27-37
Altoona (Pa.)	3,249	1,207	20.7	10.7	117,000	157,000	113,000	20-25
Harrisburg (Pa.)	2,320	1,086	20.5	13.1	98,000	113,000	83,000	10-12
Pittsburg (Pa.)	17,360	7,558	17.9	10.3	666,000	970,000	734,000	28-36
Wilmington (Del.)	1,210		17.2	10.8	34,000	70,000	(40,000)	8-16
BALTIMORE-WASH.	10,003	4,724	17.5	11.9	386,000	572,000	397,000	17-27
Wheeling (W. Va.)	1,770	863	25.2	9.3	68,000	70,000	93,000	3-4
Totals for North East	264,173	119,479†	16.0	11.3	10,633,000	16,928,000	11,051,000	29-42
Middle West:								
Toledo (Ohio)	3,854	1,962	19.2	13.1	165,000	202,000	150,000	15-20
Cleveland (Ohio)	13,877	6,051	16.5	10.6	540,000	841,000	571,000	23-35
CINCINNATI (Ohio)	5,955	3,702	18.2	12.3	254,000	327,000	300,000	17-19
Columbus (Ohio)	2,983	1,597	18.6	11.1	142,000	160,000	144,000	10-12
Fort Wayne (Ind.)	4,267	2,101	18.6	11.4	183,000	229,000	184,000	11-14
Indianapolis (Ind.)	3,691	2,040	18.4	12.3	173,000	200,000	163,000	10-12
Lansing (Mich.)	2,349	912	19.1	10.9	70,000	123,000	84,000	8-12
DETROIT (Mich.)	16,801	5,431	18.5	8.9	602,000	908,000	610,000	23-37
Saginaw (Mich.)	2,770	1,051	21.5	10.4	86,000	129,000	101,000	23-28
Grand Rapids (Mich.)	2,118	1,033	20.4	11.4	72,000	104,000	91,000	11-13
Marquette (Mich.)	2,471	1,058	19.4	10.8	89,000	127,000	98,000	30-40

* Average of 1939-1940.

† Excludes Buffalo and Wilmington deaths.

TABLE 1—*Continued*

Dioceses	Reported		Estimated Rates		Estimated Population			Per Cent of Area Catholic
	Births*	Deaths	Birth Rate	Death Rate	Catholic Directory	Birth Rate Population	Death Rate Population	
								%
Middle West—*Continued:*								
Superior (Wis.)	1,817	810	19.3	10.2	64,000	94,000	79,000	25–30
Green Bay (Wis.)	4,970	1,767	19.1	9.1	171,000	260,000	178,000	30–45
MILWAUKEE (Wis.)	10,295	4,577	16.2	10.2	460,000	635,000	449,000	29–41
La Crosse (Wis.)	3,828	1,509	19.3	9.7	140,000	198,000	155,000	22–29
Rockford (Ill.)	1,705	867	16.6	12.1	61,000	103,000	72,000	14–19
CHICAGO (Ill.)	28,944	15,377	15.2	10.9	1,400,000	1,904,000	1,410,000	31–42
Peoria (Ill.)	3,055	1,584	13.6	8.8	131,000	225,000	180,000	12–15
Springfield (Ill.)	2,549	1,382	19.1	12.3	88,000	152,000	112,000	12–16
Belleville (Ill.)	1,742	893	18.4	11.5	77,000	95,000	77,000	10–12
ST. LOUIS (Mo.)	7,843	3,740	17.8	11.0	440,000	441,000	340,000	18–23
Kansas City (Mo.)	1,694	916	18.5	12.3	78,000	92,000	75,000	7–8
St. Joseph (Mo.)	600	390	16.5	12.0	28,000	36,000	33,000	5–6
DUBUQUE (Iowa)	3,400	1,440	17.6	8.2	127,000	193,000	176,000	19–22
Davenport (Iowa)	1,604	937	17.9	11.7	61,000	90,000	80,000	13–15
Des Moines (Iowa)	980	474	18.3	10.5	41,000	54,000	45,000	8–9
Sioux City (Iowa)	2,379	751	22.6	12.4	72,000	105,000	61,000	13–22
Winona (Minn.)	1,628	852	19.4	9.5	70,000	84,000	90,000	10–11
ST. PAUL (Minn.)	8,748	3,068	17.7	9.5	314,000	494,000	323,000	27–45
St. Cloud (Minn.)	2,563	795	20.8	9.3	84,000	123,000	86,000	27–38
Duluth (Minn.)	1,794	718	18.2	9.5	71,000	99,000	76,000	20–27
Crookston (Minn.)	879	356	22.7	8.9	28,000	39,000	40,000	17–18
Totals for Middle West	154,159	70,141	20.8	9.9	6,238,000	8,866,000	6,633,000	19–25
South East:								
Richmond (Va.)	1,311	570	21.3	11.5	47,000	61,000	50,000	2–3
Raleigh (N. C.)	343	112	26.3	8.9	11,000	13,000	13,000	.03
Charleston (S. C.)	345	163	23.9	8.4	13,000	14,000	19,000	1
Covington (Ky.)	1,366	954	26.4	9.5	65,000	52,000	100,000	4–7
LOUISVILLE (Ky.)	2,954	1,314	22.9	11.4	114,000	129,000	115,000	14–16
Owensboro (Ky.)	866	318	22.3	11.7	29,000	39,000	27,000	5–7
Savannah-Atlanta (Ga.)	545	316	25.7	10.4	23,000	21,000	30,000	1
Mobile (Ala.)	1,936	584	28.0	10.4	56,000	69,000	56,000	2
Nashville (Tenn.)	881	479	23.6	10.1	33,000	38,000	48,000	1–2
Little Rock (Ark.)	871	196	26.3	8.8	34,000	33,000	22,000	1–2
Natchez (Miss.)	1,090	440	27.0	10.7	39,000	38,000	41,000	1–2
NEW ORLEANS (La.)	9,090	3,560	23.8	12.1	330,000	385,000	295,000	30–36
Alexandria (La.)	1,112	372	24.0	9.8	45,000	46,000	38,000	5
Lafayette (La.)	7,965	2,183	29.1	9.7	248,000	274,000	225,000	50–60
St. Augustine (Fla.)	1,122	470	17.4	11.6	66,000	65,000	41,000	3–4
Totals for South East	31,797	12,031	20.8	9.9	1,153,000	1,281,000	1,120,000	4–4

* Average of 1939–1940.

TABLE 1—*Concluded*

Dioceses	Reported		Estimated Rates		Estimated Population			Per cent of Area Catholic
	Births*	Deaths	Birth Rate	Death Rate	Catholic Directory	Birth Rate Population	Death Rate Population	
								%
South West:								
Oklahoma-Tulsa (Okla.)	1,386	699	22.0	8.9	64,000	63,000	79,000	3-4
SANTE FE (N. M.)....	6,220	1,603	32.1	9.1	141,000	193,000	176,000	75-84
Gallup (N. M.)........	1,779	523	26.9	11.9	30,000	66,000	44,000	15-25
Tucson (Ariz.)..........	4,178	1,186	26.6	10.7	165,000	202,000	149,000	30-40
Amarillo (Tex.).........	1,034	177	23.2	6.9	23,000	45,000	26,000	4-7
El Paso (Tex.)..........	5,019	1,125	30.2	10.3	124,000	166,000	109,000	55-70
SAN ANTONIO (Tex.).	8,670	2,593	25.8	12.6	195,000	336,000	206,000	27-45
Corpus Christi (Tex.) .	10,175	1,844	30.5	11.7	161,000	334,000	158,000	30-67
Dallas (Tex.)..........	1,781	583	19.4	9.1	47,000	92,000	64,000	3-5
Galveston (Tex.)......	5,426	1,416	21.2	9.8	201,000	256,000	145,000	10-15
Totals for South West	45,668	11,749	20.3	9.7	1,151,000	1,753,000	1,156,00	12-18
North West:								
Wichita (Kan.).........	1,284	578	17.2	10.2	57,000	75,000	57,000	6-8
Leavenworth (Kan.)....	1,573	690	15.5	11.0	80,000	101,000	63,000	11-17
Concordia (Kan.).......	1,349	382	17.8	9.4	43,000	76,000	41,000	12-23
Lincoln (Neb.)	966	381	16.3	9.8	36,000	59,000	39,000	8-12
Omaha (Neb.)..........	2,650	971	18.4	9.8	100,000	144,000	99,000	20-29
Grand Island (Neb) ...	885	339	22.0	9.2	26,000	41,000	37,000	12-14
Sioux Falls (S. D.)	1,506	622	18.6	9.0	64,000	81,000	69,000	14-16
Rapid City (S. D.).....			18.7	8.5	40,000	(48,000)	(43,000	26-30
Fargo (N. D.)..........	2,399	606	21.3	8.5	69,000	113,000	71,000	18-28
Bismarck (N. D.)	1,995	376	21.9	7.6	51,000	91,000	50,000	21-40
Great Falls (Mon.).....	1,213	412	21.9	9.6	40,000	55,000	43,000	14-18
Helena (Mon.)..........	1,381	829	19.7	11.0	45,000	70,000	75,000	25-28
Cheyenne (Wyo.).......	824	267	21.0	8.1	33,000	39,000	33,000	13-15
Denver (Colo.)........	6,678	2,011	21.9	10.9	147,000	350,000	184,000	17-33
Boise (Idaho)	795	344	23.5	9.4	21,000	34,000	37,000	7-8
Salt Lake C. (Utah)...	369	158	25.4	8.8	17,000	15,000	18,000	3-4
Totals for North West.	25,867	8,966	18.7	9.7	869,000	1,392,000	959,000	13-19
Far West:								
Reno (Nev.)...........	329	193	19.2	12.7	12,000	17,000	15,000	12-15
San Diego (Cal.)	3,372	657	19.2	11.7	142,000	176,000	56,000	23-29
LOS ANGELES (Cal.)	11,880	3,932	15.8	11.0	328,000	752,000	357,000	12-25
Monterey-Fresno (Cal.)	3,533	1,132	22.0	9.9	128,000	161,000	114,000	16-23
SAN FRANCISCO (Cal.)...............	10,267	5,450	14.3	12.6	430,000	718,000	433,000	22-36
Sacramento (Cal.).....	1,559	824	17.5	12.1	82,000	89,000	68,000	12-17
Baker City (Ore.)......	361	142	20.8	9.5	11,000	17,000	15,000	7-9
PORTLAND (Ore.)	1,593	764	16.1	11.5	56,000	96,000	66,000	7-10
Spokane (Wash.)	769	415	15.4	11.5	33,000	50,000	36,000	10-15
Seattle (Wash.).........	2,606	1,480	16.8	11.6	103,000	155,000	128,000	9-11
Totals for Far West...	36,269	14,989	16.3	11.5	1,325,000	2,231,000	1,118,000	14-23
Pittsburg Greek Rite.....					261,000			
Ukranean Greek Rite.....					293,000			

* Average of 1939–1940.

OBSERVATIONS ON THE ESTIMATES

1. The Catholic Directory estimate of 22,000,000 is too low

There are three reasons which can be advanced in support of this contention.

In the first place, the *Catholic Directory* from year to year does not record for some dioceses a sufficient increase. There are dioceses which have had the same estimates for many years. Still other dioceses have their own estimates which are at variance with the estimate of the *Catholic Directory*. One Chancery Office reported that its own estimate was 100,000 in excess of the *Catholic Directory*.

Further, when we were able to depart from the use of crude rates, and substitute in their stead more specific rates, the *Catholic Directory* estimate was found to be most conservative. For example, in the southern dioceses where it was possible to exclude the Negro from our calculations, on the presumptive ground that generally the Negro was not Catholic, we obtained estimates which were greatly in excess of those of the *Catholic Directory*.

TABLE 2

NATIONAL ESTIMATES

Source of Estimate	Estimate	Per Cent of Nation Catholic
		%
Catholic directory	22,000,000	16
Death rate	23,000,000	17
Birth rate	33,000,000	25

Finally, upon examining the tables in the preceding pages, it becomes evident that the *Catholic Directory* estimate is lower than the death rate population in seventy per cent of the dioceses. And the death rate population, in our opinion, is equally an underestimation of the Catholic population.

2. The Death Rate Estimate of 23,000,000 is also low

To maintain that the Catholic population is only 23,000,000 is to involve ourselves in three major inconsistencies.

First, if there are only 23,000,000 Catholics in the United States and they produced 550,000 children in 1940, then the Catholic birth rate is unnaturally high. Recalling the example given above, it was noted that a community of 5,000 producing 100 children in one year had a crude birth rate of 20. Now if another community of only 2,500 produced 100 children in the same year, it is obvious that its birth rate was 40. In 1940 Catholics produced 550,000 children, and if only 23,000,000 are responsible for this large number of children, then the Catholic birth rate is extremely large. On a national scale, it would be forty per cent higher than the general birth rate, on a regional scale, it would be from forty to one hundred and ten per cent higher, while for individual dioceses the Catholic birth rate would be phenomenal.

Such an excessive birth rate contradicts the opinion of population experts. Catholics are predominantly an urban people, and cities have always had, as one of their effects upon a population, a declining fertility. The immigrant, the negro, and the farmer, people who have been and are the most fertile in our nation, upon their migration to cities show a second generation birth rate which is very little higher than the urban birth rate. Hence even though Catholics have somewhat resisted the urban trend in fertility, there is no evidence to indicate that they have overthrown it. And Catholics definitely would be the only group to have withstood the urban trend in fertility, if their population is only twenty three million.

TABLE 3

CATHOLIC BIRTH RATE BASED ON THE DEATH RATE POPULATION

Region	General Birth Rate	Would-be Catholic Birth Rate	Per Cent of Difference
			%
North East	16.0	24.3	51
South East	20.8	28.2	36
Middle West	17.3	23.2	34
South West	20.3	28.2	39
North West	18.7	39.5	111
Far West	16.3	29.5	81
United States	17.9	25.3	41

Table 3 illustrates the difference between the general birth rate and the would-be Catholic birth rate, if there were only 23,000,000 Catholics in the United States.

Secondly, if only 23,000,000 Catholics produced 550,000 children in 1940, then the non-Catholic birth rate for 1940 would be unnaturally low. Once more recalling the oft-used example, let us suppose that in that community of 5,000 people, there are 2,500 Catholics who produce 75 out of the 100 children. In such a case, 2,500 non-Catholics would produce only 25 children and have a birth rate of 10.0 while the Catholic birth rate would be 30.0. If you subtract from the general population any substantial group with a high birth rate, the remainder of the group will have a much lower birth rate. This is exactly what would happen to the non-Catholic birth rate, if we maintain that the Catholic population is only 23,000,000. On a national scale, the non-Catholic birth rate would be more than fifty per cent below the Catholic birth rate, while the urban and rural non-Catholic rates would reach an all time low. Not only is there no evidence to indicate that the non-Catholic birth rate is so low, but the pre-war trend of non-Catholic birth rates tended to wipe out the differential between Catholics and non-Catholics.

Thirdly, if the Catholic birth rate has been traditionally high and is still high, then the percentage of Catholics in the United States should have increased with the passage of years. In 1920 Catholics formed sixteen per cent of the American people, while in 1940 they were still sixteen per cent—if they were only 23,000,000.

These three inconsistencies have lead us to reject this estimate of 23,000,000. And yet how is it that the 1940 Catholics deaths gave us such a low estimate?

In the first place, there may be in some dioceses an under-registration of Catholic deaths. It is not always required that the number of Catholic deaths be reported to the Chancery Office. There is also the situation where dioceses do not have up-to-date statistics on the number of deaths, and consequently rely upon figures that are a year or two old. As a matter of fact, in three dioceses that we know of there was an under-registration of Catholics deaths by the *Catholic Directory*. In the case of Gallup, for example, the actual number of Catholic deaths was twice the number of deaths in the Catholic Directory. A larger number of deaths would result in a larger death rate population.

In addition, it is suggested that Catholics may have a lower death rate than the general population. A lower death rate will also lead to a higher death rate population. As we said above, a community with a death rate of 10 and yearly number of deaths amounting to 50 should have a population of 5,000. But if another community with an annual death toll of 50 had a death rate of only 5, the estimated population would be 10,000. The same holds true in estimating the number of Catholics in the United States. The concentration of Catholics in cities would tend to give Catholics a lower crude death rate. Further, the large percentage of Catholics in elementary schools, public and parochial, and the high proportion of Catholics in the military age group would also argue, other things being equal, for a lower Catholic death rate. And if the Catholic death rate were lower, the Catholic death rate population would be more than 23,000,000.

Finally, the low death rate population may be explained in part by leakage. There are people who, though baptized Catholics, never die in the Church. In the light of past studies, the number of these defections are by no means to be considered insignificant. The fact of their baptism would swell the birth rate population, the fact of their leakage would deflate the death rate population.

3. The Birth Rate population of 33,000,000 is a more favorable estimate

There are serious reasons why we are unable to accept the lower estimates of the Catholic population in the United States, so that we are forced by negative reasoning at least into favoring the higher figure. The substantial discrepancies involved in the death rate estimate persuades us that the birth rate estimate is nearer the truth.

If the Catholic population tables given above are examined closely, we will be struck by the regularity with which the birth rate population exceeds all other estimates. No such regularity appears in the death rate estimate. Even though the death rate population exceeds the *Catholic Directory* in the vast majority of dioceses, the differential is never large, and in thirty per cent of the cases falls below the *Catholic Directory*. But the consistency of the birth rate population is so pronounced that one cannot help drawing the obvious conclusion. In almost every large diocese the birth rate estimate is twice as high as the *Catholic Directory*, while in the remaining dioceses it is more than fifty per cent higher. Only in one diocese does the birth rate population fall substantially below the other estimates.

Is it conceivable that some of the larger dioceses have twice as many Catholics as they have for a long time believed? Is it possible that many dioceses are continually underestimating the number of Catholics? It is not uncommon to hear pastors maintain that they have on record only half the number of Catholics actually living in their parishes. When we mentioned some of these large estimates to men familiar with the dioceses in which they occur, never once was great astonishment manifested. Some of these witnesses even went so far as to explain the factors which would account for such large populations, and the reasons why in a particular diocese underestimation is probable.

This negative reasoning alone, it must be pointed out, is not sufficient to substantiate the validity of the birth rate population. Consequently, it is necessary to offer some positive argumentation in favor of this estimate, admitting however that these arguments have their weaknesses.

We have employed three methods in testing the accuracy of the birth rate population.

There is, at the beginning the *fertility-proportion* method. In the United States there are about 14 women of child-bearing age (15–44) for every child born. Further, there are slightly more than 4 people in the general population for every woman of child-bearing age (15–44). Let us assume that the same proportions are true for the Catholic population, and even though these assumptions may not be entirely accurate, for our purposes they are sufficiently valid to be used. Since there were 550,000 Catholic children born in 1940, there should be 7,700,000 Catholic women aged 15–44, which would demand a Catholic population of 31,000,000.

The second method used to confirm the birth rate estimate is the *life-expectancy* method. The *life expectancy* of people in the United States is about 63 years. Thus, 550,000 Catholic children born with a life expectancy of 63 years requires a Catholic population of some 34,000,000 to produce them.

Finally, there is the *population-birth proportion.* In the United States there are 60 people in the population for every child born. If that proportion is also true for Catholics, 550,000 births would require a Catholic population of 33,000,000. (This type of proportion could not be applied to Catholic deaths, if, as we have pointed out, the present number of Catholic deaths is inadequate to explain the Catholic population.)

For all the reasons outlined in this paper, a Catholic population of 33,000,000 is to be favored, rather than an estimate of 23,000,000. However, the higher figure assumes the same birth rate for Catholics and the general population. Allowing for a slightly higher birth rate on the part of Catholics, *it is safe to conclude that the 1940 catholic population in the United States was about 30,000,000.*

Washington, D. C.

George A. Kelly.
Thomas Coogan.

THE COMMUNION OF SAINTS AND THE MYSTICAL BODY

In the ninth article of the Apostles' Creed we affirm our belief in the Communion of Saints. This formula, which did not enter the Creed until about the fifth century, has never been explained in any solemn declaration of the Catholic Church. As a result, we must rely upon the organs of the Church's ordinary *magisterium* for a satisfactory statement of its meaning.

There are extant four distinct ways of interpreting the term *Communio Sanctorum*. The first method would make the word *Sanctorum* neuter, the genitive of *Sancta*. Thus the *Communio Sanctorum* would be the common possession of holy things, the corporate enjoyment within the Catholic Church of those agencies which our Lord has instituted to help men live the life of grace.

The other interpretations accept *Sanctorum* as masculine, the genitive of *Sancti*. The English formula "Communion of Saints" is fitted to express only these interpretations. In this way the *Communio* could be understood either as the fellowship or association within a definite society or as the society itself. When the word *Communio* is understood as designating a society, then this organization is either identical with or distinct from the Catholic Church.

The explanation according to which the *Communio Sanctorum* means the common possession of means for salvation was recognized and approved by the *Catechism of the Council of Trent*. The *Catechism* taught that the formula *Communio Sanctorum* was added as a kind of explanation to the preceding expression about the Holy Catholic Church, and it goes on to explain that "the unity of the Spirit by which it [the Church] is ruled makes whatever is granted in it common, for the fruits of all the Sacraments belong to all the faithful."[1] According to the *Catechism of the Council of Trent*, not only the sacraments and the fruits of the sacraments are beneficial to all the members of the Church together, but also the charisms or the *gratiae gratis datae* are truly common possessions.[2]

Very few theologians, however, attempted to explain the *Communio Sanctorum* entirely as the common possession of instruments for salvation. Usually the proponents of Catholic teaching interpret this phrase to mean the fellowship or association with our Lord and with the blessed in heaven and the souls in purgatory enjoyed within the Catholic Church. Those in the state of grace in this world receive the full benefits accruing from this association. However, Catholics in the state of mortal sin are not wholly cut off from this communication. They receive some share from their fellowship with the Saints of God inasmuch as the blessings consequent upon the Communion of Saints tend to bring them to repentance and thus to eternal life.

---

[1] *Catechismus Concilii Tridentini, Pii V Pontificis Maximi Jussu Promulgatus.* Pars I, art. 9, Cap. 25 (translation ours).

[2] Cf. *loc. cit.* Cap. 24–28.

No man can enjoy this fellowship apart from the Catholic Church. Those who enjoy the Communion of Saints either are actually members of the Catholic Church or really intend to become members. Thus those in the state of grace, the persons who derive the full benefit from their association with the Church triumphant and the Church suffering, possess that charity which demands the love of the brotherhood. Every person in the state of grace intends to live and to die within the unity of the Catholic Church, even though, for want of proper instruction, his intention should be merely implicit.

Some theologians have used the term *Communio Sanctorum* as a definition of the Catholic Church itself. In so far as the Catholic Church extends into heaven and purgatory, it may well be defined in the formula "the society of the saints who serve God under Christ." Naturally, those who use such a definition are at pains to insist that the term *sanctorum* in the definition is not equivalent to *iustorum*. It is heretical to teach that the membership in the Church of Jesus Christ is restricted to those in the state of grace. It is theologically correct to state that the Church is the congregation of the saints, in the sense that all of those who are gathered within it either possess or profess holiness. Those in the Church triumphant and in the Church suffering actually possess holiness in the sense that they all possess the life of habitual grace. The members of the Church militant do not all possess charity, but they at least profess the holy faith of Jesus Christ, communicate in His holy sacraments and live under the holy rule He has placed within His Church.

Unfortunately, in our own day, certain writers have reacted against this last interpretation of the *Communio Sanctorum* in such a way as to sponsor another explanation, not in conformity with the Catholic traditions. In this group are certain of the finest theologians of our times. Father Dieckmann, S.J. teaches that the *Communio Sanctorum* is really distinct from the *Corpus Mysticum*, insisting that the Communion of Saints has a greater extension than the Church.[3] Father

---

[3] Cf. *De Ecclesia Tractatus Historico-Dogmatici*, Tom. II, Friburgi Brisgoviae, 1925, No. 935, pp. 235–36.

Gruden, accepting the teaching of Dieckmann, carries his conclusions still further, and holds that the Communion of Saints is really "an *invisible* society, a 'church' or '*ecclesia*' in the *broad* sense."[4] According to this theory, there are members of the Communion of Saints who are not members of the Church, and conversely there are members of the Church who do not belong to the Communion of Saints.

Radically, this view is based upon a misinterpretation of the threefold definition of the Catholic Church. The strictest definition of the Church designates it as a society visibly distinct from the other religious organizations operating in the world. According to this definition, the Church is the society of those who are united in the profession of the same Christian faith and in the communication of the same Sacraments under legitimate pastors, and in particular under the one Vicar of Christ on earth, the Roman Pontiff. The broader definition of the Church identifies it as the society which is the true Israel, the continuation in the world of the body of believers in Christ existent since the days of our first parents. According to this broader definition, the Church is the congregation of those who believe in Christ.

The broadest definition of the Church represents this organization as the assembly which extends into eternity. After all, the members of the Catholic Church on earth are really "fellow citizens with the saints and the domestics of God."[5] St. John the Apostle preached that the faithful might have fellowship with him, "and that our fellowship may be with the Father, and with His Son, Jesus Christ."[6] The Church, considered in this light, is properly defined as "the society of the saints, serving God through Christ."

The traditional theologians of the Catholic Church never intended to designate three separate organizations with these three types of definitions. The three kinds of formulae described one and the same society, but looked upon that society as it were from three distinct angles. They labored to prove that all three of these definitions applied to the Catholic Church alone among all the various religious societies existent in the world. Certainly they did not think of the Church in the broadest sense as in any way an "invisible society" distinct from the Catholic Church.

If we take the term Communion as meaning a society, then the Communion of Saints is nothing more or less than the reality described in the broadest definition of the Catholic Church. It is the covocation of the saints, serving God under Christ. There is certainly no theological warrant for supposing that this body constitutes a social unity distinct from that of the visible Catholic Church here on earth. A brief survey of the history of the formula Communion of Saints should serve to make this point clear.

---

[4] *The Mystical Christ*, St. Louis and London, B. Herder Book Co., 1936, p. 161.

[5] *Eph.* 2:19.

[6] *I John* 1:3.

One of the earliest mentions of the formula *Communio Sanctorum* with reference to a Creed is found in the *Explanatio Symboli*, attributed to Nicetas of Remesiana, and written around the beginning of the fifth century.

> After the profession of the Blessed Trinity, you profess that you believe the holy Catholic Church. But what else is the Church but the congregation of all the saints? For from the beginning of the world the patriarchs, Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, the prophets, the apostles, the martyrs and the rest of the just who have been, who are, and who will be, constitute one Church because, sanctified in one faith and manner of life and signed with one Spirit, they are made into one body: of which body Christ is the head, as we have been taught and as it is written.
>
> Again, I say more. Even the angels, even the powers and the heavenly virtues gathered together in this one Church, for the Apostle teaches us that all things, not only those which are on earth but also those which are in heaven are reconciled in Christ.
>
> *Therefore believe that you are going to achieve the communion of saints in this one Church.* Know that this Catholic Church, the communion of which you ought firmly to retain, is established throughout the entire world. There are other Churches, which are false, but you should avoid these.[7]

As far as the author of this treatise is concerned, the Communion of Saints was certainly a fellowship to be found within the Catholic Church alone. He stresses the very concept of the Church which Fathers Dieckmann and Gruden have disliked, and which they have proposed as that of an "invisible society," a Church merely in the broad sense of the term. But Nicetas identifies the Church, which is distinguished here on earth as a society distinct from the conventicles of the Marcionites and the Manicheans, as the organization which includes the saints and even the angels, and the society within which men may attain fellowship with the blessed in heaven.

Commenting on Psalm 149, St. Augustine too recognized the Church which he defended as existing both on earth and in heaven.

---

[7] *MPL* 52, col. 871. Migne ascribes this work to Niceta of Aquileia.

> It has begotten us. It is the Church of the Saints. In part in pilgrimage, in great part dwelling in heaven, it has nourished us. In so far as it dwells in heaven, it is the blessedness of the angels. In so far as it is in pilgrimage in this world, it is the hope of the just.[8]

In his *Enchiridion* the great Father of the Church insists that the angels are not members of the Church in the same manner as the men who have been redeemed by our Lord. At the same time he states again that the Church on earth is a part of the organization in which the angels in heaven are included. It is interesting to compare the two passages. Speaking of the difference between the Church of the angels and the Church militant, St. Augustine stresses the visibility of this latter as contrasted with the comparative invisibility of the angelic choirs.

> The Church among the holy angels and the powers of God will be apparent to us when we shall be joined to it in the end in possessing the same eternal happiness. But that which is in pilgrimage from it on earth is better known to us because we are in it and because it is made up of men like ourselves. This latter has been redeemed from every sin by the blood of a Mediator without sin. . . . For Christ did not die for the angels.[9]

At the same time St. Augustine adverts to the doctrine of the Communion of Saints, (without however using this term), when he teaches that the angels in heaven and the faithful on earth belong to the same organization.

> Here [this Church] is considered as a whole, and not merely according to the part which is in pilgrimage on earth, praising the name of the Lord from the rising to the setting of the sun, and singing the new canticle after the ancient captivity. [It is considered also] in that [part] which has always, since it was established, been joined to God in heaven and which has never experienced any evil of loss. This latter stands blessed in the holy angels, and it helps, as it should, that portion of itself which is in pilgrimage. Both portions will be one in their lot for all eternity. Now they are one by the bond of charity, because the whole was established for the worship of the one God.[10]

The part of the Church which is in pilgrimage here on earth is of course the Church militant, the true Church of Jesus Christ, which Augustine defended so ably against the heretics of his own time. This true Church was the Catholic Church, the organization which will contain good and bad members until the day of the general judgment. The members of this one Church were in fellowship with the blessed and the angels in heaven. The Church, with its perfect and imperfect members was the recipient of aid from the angelic hosts. There was, according to St. Augustine, a real and dynamic association with the blessed in heaven in and through this visible Catholic Church. There is certainly no warrant for teaching that the Communion of Saints is a sort of invisible society, distinct from the Catholic Church, since social union with the blessed in heaven is to be found through the visible Body of Christ.

---

[8] *MPL* 37, col. 1952.

[9] Cap. 16. *MPL* 40, col. 260–61.

[10] Cap. 15. *ibid.* col. 258–59.

What St. Augustine proposes as invisible is simply the union of the angels within the Church of God. He preached that they are joined to us now, and that they will be united to us for all eternity in a common worship of the Triune God. In his writings the Church militant is represented as *in pilgrimage*, as temporarily absent from its true home in the courts of heaven. Yet, during the course of this pilgrimage the Church militant remains in communication with its associates in the eternal homeland. Certainly there is no reason to say that the Saints in heaven belong to any society distinct from the Church, and including in its membership all of those persons in the state of grace here on earth.

St. Thomas Aquinas, treating explicitly of the Communion of Saints, taught that the good of one member of the Church was communicated to all the other members.

> The Communion of Saints. As in a natural body the operation of one member contributes to the good of the entire body, so it is in the spiritual body which is the Church. And because all the faithful are one body, the good of the one is communicated to the other. As it is said in the Epistle to the Romans, chapter 12, [v. 5]: *Every one members one of another*. Hence among the other matters which the Apostles have taught us that we must believe is the doctrine that there is a communion of goods in the Church, and this is the thing called the Communion of Saints. Among the other members of the Church, the principal member is Christ, because He is the Head, as it is written in the first chapter of the Epistle to the Ephesians, [v. 22]: *He hath made Him Head over all the Church*. Therefore the good of Christ is communicated to all Christians as the power of the head to all its members, and this communication takes place through the Sacraments of the Church.[11]

---

[11] *Expositio super Symbolo Apostolorum*. (This opusculum is numbered 33 in the Mandonnet edition and 6 in the traditional Roman collection.) The translation is ours.

Many of the great counter-Reformation theologians wrote about the Communion of Saints. None of them considered it as an invisible society in any way distinct from the Catholic Church. Thus Frederick Nausea, the famous Bishop of Vienna (†1552), interpreted the Communion of Saints as the common possession of spiritual goods by the members of the Church triumphant and the Church militant. At the same time, however, he designated the Church itself as the Communion of Saints.

> So Christian piety believes that Church to be holy which is the Catholic Church and the Communion of Saints. Both still fighting here on earth and triumphing in heaven it shares universally one God, one Pastor, one faith and one baptism, the same merits and prayers, the same sacraments and especially the Eucharist which is the sacrament of all unity and concord.[12]

In his paraphrase of the ninth article of the Apostles' Creed Nausea offers a still more complete statement of his belief.

> I believe also the Communion of Saints. That is I believe that through the sacraments of this Church and also through the faith of this same Church I have been united in a certain communion with Christ our Head and with all the saints, and that I have been made one with them, in such a way that whatever good Christ and His saints either already dead or still living have ever merited, comes in its entirety to me as long as I believe sincerely and remain within the Church, and that it will avail unto my salvation so that I need never despair of attaining eternal life.[13]

The *Catechism of the Council of Trent*, which appeared twenty-two years after the *Catholicus Catechismus* of Nausea, followed the same line. Fellowship with the Father and with Christ is to be found in the Communion of Saints. There is a common possession of spiritual goods among the members of the Church. The *Catechism of the Council of Trent* insisted that the faithful in the state of mortal sin are not entirely cut off from this fellowship, even though the full benefit of the Communion of Saints comes only to those who live the life of habitual grace.[14] The *Catechism* makes no reference to the members of the Church triumphant or the Church suffering in its exposition of this article.

---

[12] Lib. II, p. 20^v (translation ours). The dedication of this book was written in 1552 in Vienna. The time and place of publication are not mentioned.

[13] *Loc. cit.* (translation ours).

[14] Cf. *loc. cit.* Cap. 24–28.

John Hessels (†1566), writing at Louvain four years before his death, identified the Church absolutely with the Communion of Saints.

> The Church is said to be the Communion or the society of saints because all the saints are gathered together in it, as one body united through one spirit, through the bond of peace and charity.[15]

The great Cardinal Stanislaus Hosius (†1579) was perfectly willing to accept the term Communion of Saints as a definition of the Church as long as the word saints was not considered as synonymous with those in possession of the state of grace. He adverted to the fact that St. Paul had saluted the members of the primitive Church as saints, regardless of the perfection of their spiritual lives. However, Hosius taught that the expression signified the community of spiritual goods within the Church and insisted that these goods were the common property of those within the Church militant and the Church triumphant.

> This Communion of Saints must be understood in this manner. All the merits of the saints, both those who still fight at our side here on earth and those who now triumph in heaven after they have fought the good fight and have received the crown of glory, are communicated to us, plead for us, aid us.[16]

St. Peter Canisius (†1597) explained the Communion of Saints so effectively that most catechisms since his time have followed his method.

> In the fourth place [we believe] that the Communion of Saints is in the same Church, in such a way that those who dwell within the Church as within the house or the family of God retain a certain fellowship and union among themselves and, as members of one body, aid each other by their mutual duties, merits and prayers. Among these there is unity of faith, agreement in doctrine and the same use of the sacraments. They are careful to retain the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace.[17]

In his smaller cathechism he explicitly adverts to the fact that the Communion of Saints exists in such a way as to include not only the faithful on earth, (St. Peter Canisius does not limit this communion to those who enjoy the state of grace), but also the blessed in heaven and the souls in purgatory.[18]

---

[15] *Brevis et Catholica Symboli Apostolici Explicatio*, Louvain, 1562, Cap. 70, p. 39ʳ (translation ours).

[16] *Confessio Catholicae Fidei Christiana*, Cap. 31. In the *Opera Omnia* Vol. I, Cologne, 1584, p. 71 (translation ours).

[17] *Summa Doctrinae Christianae*, Cap. 1, no. 17. In Father Streicher's critical edition (Rome and Munich, 1933), *Catechismi Latini*, p. 89 (translation ours).

The old Baltimore Catechism taught that "the Saints and we are members of the same Church, because the Church in heaven and the Church on earth are one and the same Church, and all its members are in communion with one another."[19] It defined the Communion of Saints as "the union which exists between the members of the Church on earth with one another, and with the blessed in heaven and with the suffering souls in purgatory."[20] The revised version teaches that the Communion of Saints means "the union of the faithful on earth, the blessed in heaven, and the souls in purgatory, with Christ as their head."[21]

Cardinal Gasparri's Catechism repeats the teaching of the *Catechism of the Council of Trent.* "The second part of the Ninth Article of the Creed—'the Communion of Saints'—is connected with the first part as in some sort explaining it, for it teaches us what benefit the members of the Church may gain from the holiness obtained in and through the Church." Cardinal Gasparri asserts that "by this second part of the Ninth Article of the Creed we mean that between the members of the Church—in Heaven, in Purgatory, and on earth—there exists, by reason of their close union with one another under Christ their Head, a mutual communication in spiritual riches."[22]

The Catechism *Catholic Faith* adverts explicitly to the fellowship which constitutes the Communion of Saints as existing within the Mystical Body of Jesus Christ. "By the Communion of Saints we mean that the members of the Church in Heaven, in purgatory, and on earth, are all one family of God, loving and helping one another as members of the Mystical Body of Christ."[23] Unfortunately, however, *Catholic Faith* speaks of "membership" in the Communion of Saints as something distinct from membership in the Church.[24] This terminology is not sanctioned by Cardinal Gasparri's Catechism, on which *Catholic Faith* is based. The Cardinal spoke of the enjoyment of this fellowship. He did not consider the Communion of Saints as a society in any way distinct from the true Church.[25]

---

[18] *Institutiones et Exercitamenta Christianae Pietatis,* Cap. 1, no. 14. In *op. cit.* p. 241 (translation ours).

[19] Lesson 31, q. 336.

[20] *Loc. cit.*, q. 338.

[21] Lesson 13, q. 170.

[22] *The Catholic Catechism,* drawn up by his Eminence Peter Cardinal Gasparri, Only authorized English translation, by Reverend Hugh Pope, O.P., Third printing, New York, P. J. Kenedy and Sons, 1932, q. 170, pp. 110–11.

[23] Q. 143.

In the article "Communion of Saints" in the *Catholic Encyclopedia*, Joseph Francis Sollier teaches that this communion is "the spiritual solidarity which binds together the faithful on earth, the souls in purgatory, and the saints in heaven in the organic unity of the same mystical body under Christ its head, and in a constant interchange of supernatural offices."[26] In his book *The Communion of Saints* Charles McGinnis writes that "In one word, the expression, Communion of Saints, comprises the Church Militant, Triumphant, and Suffering."[27] His definition of the Communion of Saints as well as the definition set forth by Archbishop Ireland in the introduction to his work, accords fully with that of Sollier.[28] The same definition, for all intents and purposes, is to be found in the brilliant article on the Communion of Saints by Father Bernard in the *Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique*[29] and in the treatise on the Communion of Saints by the scholarly French Franciscan, Valentin Breton.[30]

In the light of the literature on the Communion of Saints, the following conclusions are amply justified.

I: If the term, Communion of Saints, be used to designate a society then this social unit is none other than the Church which is the Mystical Body of Jesus Christ.

II: The term is ordinarily used to indicate a fellowship within a society. The society within which the fellowship exists is the Catholic Church. Thus the only persons who enjoy this fellowship are those who either are or intend to become members of the Catholic Church.

III: The members of the Church receive the benefit of their association with the blessed in heaven through the sacraments and the corporate and private acts of worship existent within the Church. Thus the common spiritual possessions of Catholics are at once the channels through which men receive favors from God, through which the souls in purgatory are benefited, and by which the saints in heaven are honored.

---

[24] Cf. q. 144.

[25] Cf. q. 172.

[26] Vol. 4, p. 171.

[27] *The Communion of Saints*, St. Louis, B. Herder Book Co., 1912, p. 27.

[28] McGinnis' definition is found on page 26, that of Archbishop Ireland on page vi.

[29] Cf. Vol. 3, col. 447.

[30] *The Communion of Saints*, St. Louis, B. Herder Book Co., 1934, pp. 120–21.

IV: There is no invisible Church, no religious society distinct from the Catholic Church, of which men in the state of grace are members. The only society which can rightly be denominated as the Communion of Saints is the true Church of Jesus Christ, the Mystical Body.

Washington, D. C. JOSEPH CLIFFORD FENTON.

Answers to Questions

HOLY NAME COMMUNION SUNDAY

Question: The *Manual* of the Holy Name Society asserts that the members are obliged to receive Holy Communion with the Society on Holy Name Sunday. Please state how this is to be reconciled with the decree of the Congregation of the Sacraments, explained in the March issue of the *American Ecclesiastical Review* in the article "Holy Communion Through Coercion."

Answer: The decree to which reference is made implicitly answers this question, for it repeats the ruling of the decree *Sacra Tridentina Synodus* to this effect: "If there are any institutes of either solemn or simple vows, in whose rules and constitutions, or calendars, Communions are attached to certain days and ordered to be received on those days, these rules are to be considered merely directive and not preceptive" (Bouscaren, *Canon Law Digest*, Vol. II, p. 214).

Now, if the rules of a religious order commanding the members to receive Holy Communion on certain days are merely directive, not preceptive, *a fortiori* the same is true of the rules of a society of lay Catholics, such as the Holy Name Society. In other words, the rule of this Society concerning the reception of Holy Communion by the members on Holy Name Sunday of each month is to be regarded as a counsel, the omission of which will not render a member liable to any penalty, such as expulsion from the Society.

PROMISES IN MIXED MARRIAGES

Question: Do the promises, which must be given by both parties for the validation of a mixed marriage, regarding the Catholic baptism and education of all the children (Canon 1061, 1, 2), refer only to those children who may be born afterward, or also to those previously born to the couple—for example, after a civil marriage?

Answer: From a decree given by the Holy Office on January 16, 1942 (*Acta Apost. Sedis*, Vol. 34, p. 22) it is evident that the promises required in the case proposed need to be extended only to children who may be born later, and not to any who have previously been born to the couple. This decision is a reversal of the opinion quite commonly proposed by canonists and theologians heretofore (cf. Gasparri, *De Matrimonio*, I, n. 451; Gougnard, *Tractatus de Matrimonio*, p. 425; Pruemmer, *Manuale Theologiae Moralis*, III, n. 788). However, the decree goes on to say that, although *per se* the promises are not required by virtue of Canon 1061 as regards children already born, nevertheless the parties to the marriage are to be warned of their grave obligation by the divine law to provide for the Catholic upbringing of these children also.

Francis J. Connell, C.SS.R.

MORE ABOUT MONSIGNORI IN MUFTI

Question: Is a Domestic Prelate permitted to assist in the sanctuary wearing the house cassock with the shoulder cape?

Answer: In the February issue, while we remarked that in Rome *Monsignori*, even of the highest rank, sometimes assisted at sacred functions and even officiated at them clad in unadorned black cassocks and sacerdotal surplices, we also stated that "so far as authoritative sources are concerned, there is no provision for a prelate to assist at a sacred function in any other costume than his choir dress." The prelatial robes are always proper for the celebration of Mass or for assisting in the sanctuary at a public service. Custom has sanctioned the wearing of a black cassock, usually the one ornamented with the colored piping and buttons, at Low Mass. For devotions, especially those of a non-liturgical character, there is in many places the custom for *Monsignori* to appear in simple cassock and surplice. The garment with the shoulder cape and the false sleeves, by the way, is not a cassock but a *simmarre* (anglicized simar), designed to be worn in the house or at functions outside the Church, and hence not when the cassock is prescribed. (Cf. Barbier de Montault, *Le Costume et les Usages Ecclésiastiques*, Vol. I, Chap. 8.) Here again there is a widespread use of the simar where a cassock, black but with the reddish buttons and trimmings and without the shoulder cape, should properly be worn.

Our response several months ago was not intended as sabotage of the protocol requiring prelates to appear "in purple and fine linen" at sacred functions, but to record the fact that even in Rome one finds *Monsignori* "in mufti" which, though common, is still unauthorized. In this contribution we are commenting on the equally unauthorized but common custom in the United States of wearing a simar when, correctly speaking, a cassock is the proper garment.

THE ORDINATION MASS ON A DOUBLE OF THE FIRST CLASS

Question: A difficulty arose here with regard to the ordinations which were scheduled for the eve of Passion Sunday. This year the feast of the Annunciation, a double of the first class, coincided with this Saturday, one of the days specially designated by the *Codex Juris* for ordinations. Should we have said the Mass of the feast, with the orations for conferring of Holy Orders under one conclusion and then the orations of the *feria* under a separate conclusion, or should the Mass of the Saturday have been said even on March 25th?

Answer: Incredible as it may seem, when ordinations *in sacris* are held on the Ember Saturdays, or on the Saturday *Sitientes* preceding Passion Sunday, the Mass is to be that of the *feria*, even though a feast of the highest rank, like that of the Annunciation, should fall on such a Saturday. This is the provision of the rubrics of the Missal (*Additiones et Variationes*, I, 5). It is noted, however, that should there be no other Mass, either *cantata* or conventual, a commemoration, *sub distincta conclusione*, is to be made of the occurring double of the first or second class. Naturally, the orations *in collatione sacrorum ordinum* are added, under one conclusion, to the orations of the ferial Mass. This prescription, requiring the ferial Mass on the Saturdays designated in the Code as ordination days even if feasts of high rank happen to fall on them, has been frequently the subject of legislation in decrees of the Sacred Congregation of Rites. (Cf. 2179, *ad* 1; 2294, *ad* 1; 2375 *ad* 2; and 2473, *ad* 1 *et* 2.) Thus, decree 2294, *ad* 1, explicitly prescribes the Mass of the *feria* for an ordination Saturday on which may fall a feast *cujuscumque classis aut solemnitatis*. Decree 2473, 1, 2, orders the abolishing of any custom of saying the Mass of the feast, however important, as the ordination Mass on any of the prescribed Saturdays. Hence, in the case proposed, the Mass at which the orders are conferred on the Saturday *Sitientes* is to be that of the *feria* even on March 25.

WILLIAM J. LALLOU.

Quodlibet

This month we record the deaths of five great Catholic scholars. On Sunday, March 26, Monsignor George Barry O'Toole died in his room in Curley Hall at the Catholic University of America. He was the co-founder and the first rector of the Catholic University of Peking in China. Since 1937 he had labored as Professor of Philosophy at the Catholic University. At the time of his death he was editor-in-chief of the *China Monthly*, a magazine published in New York. A few days before his death he gave a manuscript, "Three Proofs of God's Existence," to the *American Ecclesiastical Review*. We shall consider it an honor to publish, in a forthcoming number, what was probably the the last work of this great writer.

We learn with sorrow that an air raid on the German city of Muenster on October 10, 1943, resulted in the deaths of two distinguished champions of theological science. One of the victims was the octogenarian Canon Franz Diekamp, whose *Katholische Dogmatik* was universally considered as one of the best text books on dogmatic theology. The work went through ten editions in German and was translated into Latin. After serving as professor for thirty years in the University of Muenster, Canon Diekamp was named professor emeritus ten years ago. With him died the famous Wilhelm Brede, who translated the Epistles of St. Peter for the Bonn Bible, of which he was one of the editors.

On January 27 of this year Father Joseph Schmidlin died in Muenster. He had held the first chair of History of the Catholic Missions in Germany. His *Katholische Missionslehre im Grundriss*, translated into English as *Catholic Mission Theory*, (Mission Press, Techny Ill.), was regarded as a classic in the field. Father Schmidlin was ousted from his teaching position because of his outspoken opposition to the Nazis. He had lived in retirement for several years.

On February 17 of this year Monsignor Joseph Wilpert, Dean of the Protonotaries Apostolic, died in Rome. He was an outstanding worker in the field of Christian archeology. He won fame among scholars by reason of his work on the paintings in the Roman catacombs and his studies on the mosaics in the ancient basilicas.

EUGENE M. BURKE, C.S.P.

Book Reviews

ORESTES BROWNSON, YANKEE, RADICAL, CATHOLIC. By Theodore Maynard. New York, The Macmillan Company, 1943. Pp. xvi + 456. $3.00.

Dr. Theodore Maynard, in offering this new biography, adds to his already eminent contribution to the history of American Catholicism. To the Brownson revival he conveys the most quickening impulse up to the present.

As a biographer of Orestes Brownson, Dr. Maynard had access to rich source material and while drawing upon it continually for documentation he is never overwhelmed by it; nor is the reader. Subduing everything to clear and objective portraiture, setting the many-phased career of Brownson in a just perspective and at every point dominating his material, the author presents a highly interesting and balanced biography, a definitive life of his subject.

Orestes Brownson, a large man in mind and purpose, as in physique, played a large part in any scene in which he was an actor. That scene was, in the movement of the years, Yankee, Protestant, Radical, Catholic and always American. In the Protestant New England of his time he wrote and preached the religion of humanity, philanthropy and progress. He belonged to the group of thinkers and philosophers of the Brook Farm period and held as large a place in it as Emerson, Thoreau, Alcott, Channing and Parker.

Having undergone the similar experience of conversion to Catholicism from the extreme Protestant position, Dr. Maynard describes with understanding the passage of the religious traveler through Calvinism, Universalism and Unitarianism to the Catholic Church. With the further advantage of deep interest and success in the exposition of American Catholicism from its historical point of view, the biographer exhibits a detailed but clear picture of his subject's Catholic life.

Throughout the book Dr. Maynard offers many valuable estimates and criticisms of Brownson's fundamental doctrines and opinions. It must be mentioned that the author does not make the moment of personal disagreement or a point of error the occasion of exultation over a mind that spent itself in the service of truth and the Faith. In addition new light is thrown on important aspects of Brownson's life, such as his relations with the Paulists and *The Catholic World*, European thinkers, the Jesuits and his ecclesiastical superiors; then again, his family life, philosophy of government, *Quarterly Review* and other writings. An especially noteworthy contribution is an analysis of Brownson's *The Convert* and his peculiar apologetic method.

Dr. Maynard's treatment of the Brownsonian philosophy is limited to points calculated to be of interest to the general reader. Thus we are given Brownson's notions on philosophical method and the teaching of philosophy in Catholic schools, his quarrels with other philosophers and teachers of philosophy and what the biographer considers to be Brownson's main contribution to metaphysics, the so-called Ontologism. This latter doctrine is handled in a manner quite simple and deft; the reader is spared the technicalities and hard thinking of a more profound treatment.

Dr. Maynard, though not in agreement with Brownson on all points, concludes his exposition of the Brownsonian metaphysic with a judgment in favour of its orthodoxy. This reviewer does not agree that the way to such a solution is to be sought in a mere clarification of terminology. The reviewer ventures to suggest that an examination from an historical rather than dialectical point of view promises a more satisfying solution. Historically Ontologism is not simply a modification of Cartesianism; it is rather a metaphysical tangent of an older and honored doctrine, Augustinianism. Brownson entered the Augustinian tradition by way of the tangent; on his own admission, through Gioberti. This was his first disadvantage but, to give him credit, he struggled to think his way back to an orthodox position. His ultimate doctrine, it appears, will be vindicated just in so far as it can be shown to have reached the master curve drawn originally by St. Augustine himself.

In summary, this biography of Orestes Brownson is a sustained and lively portrait of a great defender of the dignity and freedom of the human mind and of a devoted and zealous son of the Church. Informative and valuable footnotes, an exceptionally practical index and a useful bibliography further enhance the fine qualities of this work.

WILLIAM F. FINNERAN, S.J.

THE EUCHARIST, THE MYSTERY OF HOLY THURSDAY. By François Mauriac, Translated by Marie-Louise Dufrenoy, with an Introduction by Thomas F. Burke, C.S.P. New York and Toronto, Longmans, Green and Co., 1944. Pp. 75. $1.50.

Granting theological accuracy, a book such as this may only be fairly reviewed in terms of its particular purpose. M. Mauriac tells us that he writes it neither as poet, theologian nor teacher but only as a record of his meditations on the doctrine of the Holy Eucharist as it manifests itself in the liturgical setting of Holy Thursday. The results form a series of short meditative essays, which like most meditations, vary in quality and appeal but at the same time each evidences the riches of thought that can be evoked by this sacrament.

For the priest who is in search of fresh approaches and ideas for his Holy Hour talks and sermons on the Eucharist, almost every page offers one or more such illuminations. Two of the meditations are of especial interest, the one on "Holy Orders" and the one on "The Washing of the Feet." This last offers some penetrating and provocative insights into the problem of the holiness of Christians which are close akin to the ideas of M. Bernanos on "Mediocrity and Sanctity."

By way of criticism it may be remarked that, though the author states in his preface that "it is not in quest of recollections of childhood that one opens a book on Holy Thursday," still there are a number of such in the book as written. While it is true that these are meditations and so personal things, it is also true that they are published meditations and so meant for others and on this basis a number of the recollections that are used by way of illustration are either too much a part of their French setting to have any real community of interest and idea for the ordinary reader, or by their retrospective approach lose their sharpness of point in the matter of stimulating the reader because they impede rather than advance the thought. Exception might also be taken to the statement on page 16 that the Eucharist is the touchstone of faith because it divided minds when it was announced. Rather is it, in Peter's words, Christ Himself who is the touchstone of faith, because He has the words of eternal life.

EUGENE M. BURKE, C.S.P.

PUBLIC SPEAKING. Minimum Requirements in Sixteen Progressive Assignments. By William R. Duffey, M.A., and Francis A. Duffey, M.A. St. Louis, B. Herder Book Company, 1944. Pp. xv + 338. $2.50.

This work will be of great value to the teacher and the students, so fresh is it in its treatment and approach to the public speaking situation. Planned to meet the *minimum* requirements in speech training, the text, if carefully followed, will have the *maximum* effect, for it is thorough in its plan and painstaking in its execution.

There is a wealth of material in the text that can be of great service to the teacher in the matter of assignments. Suggested in the work are a variety of "projects" which add new interest to classroom procedure. The "home projects" are especially thought-provoking, and, if not only suggested but demanded of the student, they would serve to make him both speech-conscious while away from the class and ready and willing to participate more actively in the classroom procedure. The teacher of speech will find in this work a complete text, one that will serve as a suitable guide in the study of the speech arts, and a ready reference book to which he can refer frequently for correct theory, helpful suggestions, and a refreshing approach to the public speaking situation.

The book's value lies in its completeness. It is thought, however, that this text is of more value to the pupil of college level. If any other fault may be found with the work, it is that the authors trust too much to the student's initiative. While it is true that the student must develop himself in order to express himself correctly and effectively, it must always be remembered that this can be done only under the wise and capable guidance of a good teacher.

P. J. O'CONNOR.

MEN OF MARYKNOLL. By James Keller and Meyer Berger. New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1943. Pp. 191. $2.00.

Here we have a thrilling story, as thrilling as any which this war has produced, of the deeds of valorous men in their missionary outposts in the Far East and in South America. Many of the stories feature names which are very familiar to those who have followed the Maryknoll effort, Fathers Joe Sweeney, Bernard Meyer, Robert Cairns, Gerard Donovan, William Cummings, but the dangers and the horrors of the war have called for such immense sacrifices and such heroic measures that each has taken on a new and greater and nobler stature.

These are stories which should be widely circulated for they are thrilling in the best sense of the word and highly inspiring. They will have universal appeal. The authors, evidently inspired to unusual efforts by the material before them, have done an excellent piece of work.

F. A. MULLIN.

THE BOOK OF CEREMONIES. By Rev. Laurence J. O'Connell, former Master of Ceremonies, St. Mary of the Lake Seminary, Mundelein, Illinois. Milwaukee, The Bruce Publishing Company, 1943. Pp. xxvi + 605. $4.50.

This handy and comprehensive volume of directions for the conduct of ecclesiastical ceremonies, with special reference to conditions in the United States, occupies a position between two similar volumes in the English language, the old *Baltimore Ceremonial* and Fortescue's *The Ceremonies of the Roman Rite Described*. It lacks the authority of the now unobtainable Baltimore manual and is less inclusive and not so well written as Fortescue's book, but it fills very well a need in the literature of this *genre* for a convenient volume, written in the vernacular and brought up to date with the latest decisions of the Roman Congregations and adapted to the usage and practice of the Church in the United States.

In addition to matters directly referring to ceremonial, Father O'Connell's book includes much that is usually to be found only in a work devoted to the broader subject of Liturgy. Thus, we find, and it is very convenient that we do, the regulations governing the variable parts of the Mass and the directions concerning Votive and Requiem Masses. Other unusual, but handy, inclusions in this volume are the clear statement of certain general principles which are to be followed in the conduct of ceremonies and a summary of the legislation regulating altars, vestments, and other liturgical appurtenances. There is an interesting, critical bibliography of standard works on ceremonies in the front of the volume and a comprehensive glossary of technical terms at the end. Mention should be made also of the musical supplement with its practical and (generally) understandable directions for singing the liturgical chants.

Suggested ceremonies for non-liturgical functions, like the Stations of the Cross, add to the useful features of the book. We note, too, a treatment of the Dialogue Mass and of the blessing of the throats on St. Blase's Day with the consolatory decision of the Sacred Congregation that the candles need not be lighted on this occasion. There is a full ritual for Mass with an assistant priest, which is the subject of so much discussion and the occasion for so much home-made ceremonial when a First Mass is to be celebrated. Following the method, which makes Martinucci so satisfactory to consult, detailed instructions are given for each minister of a sacred function, so that no matter of how few "sides," as the actors say, a part may consist, one does not have to read the entire ceremonial to find out what his individual duties are.

There are certain omissions, which no doubt are to be accounted for by the desire not to increase the size of an already bulky volume. For all that, we should like to have seen included the ceremonies of Holy Week, especially since there is satisfactory treatment of Candlemas Day and Ash Wednesday. Again, the directions for the ceremony of marriage might be fuller and some suggestions included for mixed marriages, which are dismissed with a mere reference. *De Defectibus*, if taken into account at all, should be less summarily dealt with, even at the risk of *excursus* into the domain of moral theology. In this connection, however, notice should be taken of the author's discussion of the circumstances under which Mass may be interrupted. On the critical side, we feel that we should add that there is at times, but only at times, a lack of clear distinction between what is prescribed by liturgical law and what is merely the conclusion of some writer on matters liturgical.

Father O'Connell's book can be safely recommended as a practical guide for the conduct of most of the ceremonies which our priests are called upon to perform either in parish churches or the chapels of Seminaries and similar institutions.

WILLIAM J. LALLOU.

HOW TO THINK. By Arthur D. Fearon, Ph.D. San Francisco, College Publishing Co., 1943. Pp. 194, with 34 figures in text.

This valuable work sets out to inculcate the art, as distinguished from the science, of logic. It is written with a view not to the requirements of the specialist, but to the needs of the boy in high school, "anyone fourteen years old," or the man in the ordinary walks of life. The fundamental rules of thought, the proper way to study and learn, are explained in simple, non-technical language, with copious illustrations and exercises, and with constant emphasis on the thousand and one applications to everyday experience.

The first section shows how to analyze, beginning with the sentence and working through to the lengthy article. The second takes up the laws of association. The third teaches the efficient combination of analysis and association in memorizing, giving considerable attention to mnemonic devices. The fourth is really the most striking portion of the work; it is fascinating to see the essentials of logic stripped of abstruse terminology and put into familiar English. The fifth section contains a brief but telling statement of ideals.

This is the best treatise of its kind known to the reviewer. That it should be sound was of course to be expected from a writer who has already distinguished himself by his publications in philosophy. But Professor Fearon has succeeded in the much harder task of making a difficult subject eminently intelligible to the average reader and practical, "walking among the lowly homes of men." His work deserves to become a standard text in every high school. It is not, however, meant only for the learner; it may be unhesitatingly recommended to all as an easy and interesting opportunity to brush up on perhaps half-forgotten portions of philosophy.

MARTIN J. HIGGINS.

PROFESSIONAL SECRECY IN THE LIGHT OF MORAL PRINCIPLES. By Robert E. Regan, O.S.A., S.T.D. Washington, D. C., Augustinian Press, 1943. Pp. xv + 223. $2.50.

This book deals methodically, in the thorough scholastic style, with the moral issues involved in the confidential rights of a client to the observance of secrecy on the part of the medical profession, the legal profession, the priest in his extra-Sacramental official ministration and the professional social worker. Due attention is given also the obligations of assistants in all these departments.

Before drawing the particular moral implications, Doctor Regan gives successively and neatly the principles pertinent to the various types of secrecy, adding an interesting chapter on professional secrecy and the civil law. His moral conclusions are reached as inescapable deductions from principles of the divine natural law, which must be defended with all the zeal of a martyr when necessary.

Interesting, though of lesser importance, is his question as to whether this theme should be classified as a part of the treatise on justice or rather be considered under *injusta denigratio* of the Eighth Commandment. Dr. Regan analyzes profoundly the essential nature of confidential secrecy, establishing its uttermost roots in the basic right of the individual to the knowledge of certain things—a right insinuated by the Author of Nature, Who alone can penetrate the thoughts and sentiments man claims as his very own. Thus we have a divinely granted right to possess secrets and it rests with ourselves to retain them or to reveal them, with the conditions we may choose.

Society is particularly concerned with the safe-guarding of the professional secret. The harm done, not only to the individual but also to society, must be weighed before a complete notion of the malice of violated secrecy can be grasped.

We are furnished with some excellent guiding principles and cautions before the liberating and excusing factors from the obligation of professional secrecy are announced and explained.

The sure sign of the good moralist is also evident in Dr. Regan's prudent but fearless suggestions concerning practical conduct in the face of possible unjust civil law which conscience cannot respect.

When a dissertation has satisfied the requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Theology and at the same time is of a nature to call for extensive circulation among the laity, it may reasonably be presumed to have great potential power for good. It is to be hoped that physicians, nurses and social workers will have the fine work of Dr. Regan made available to them for their practical guidance. The members of the legal profession especially will profitably peruse this carefully prepared and practical defense of the sacrosanct character of certain social offices which will suffer untold harm and lose prestige unless the high moral principles here evoked are enforced.

MICHAEL HARDING, O.F.M.

ONCE IN CORNWALL. By S. M. C. of the English Dominican Congregation of St. Catherine of Siena. New York, Longmans, Green and Co., 1944. Pp. viii + 179. $2.00.

The subtitle of this book, "Being an account of Friar Peter's journey in search of the saint and dragon legends of the land," gives us an adequate description of the contents of the story. These legends are very interesting and gain much from the fact that they are retold under unusual circumstances. The connecting story is in itself a good recreational treat. And, as in most of the S.M.C. books, it is very well told. In this respect it equals *Brother Petroc's Return.*

But is there sufficient need for the secrecy of "S.M.C."? This reviewer is only one of a multitude of admiring readers who are constantly irritated by the comparative anonymity assumed by the author. It raises rather ridiculous and contradictory revelations from many who are positive that they have identified S.M.C. It is a device hardly fair to publisher, to reader, or to author. I read this book only because of a request to do so. But I am not going to go on talking about S.M.C. although I should like very much to do so. I usually like to know what I am talking about.

F. A. MULLIN.